

EMERGENCY REVENUE LEGISLATION.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted seven amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 18891) to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. WARREN, it was

Ordered. That authority be, and is hereby, granted to withdraw the papers filed in support of Senate bill No. 2016, Sixty-second Congress, first session, for the relief of Fred C. and C. Helen Fisher, no adverse report having been made thereon.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, executive clerk, announced that the President had, on September 29, 1914, approved and signed the following act:

S. 4274. An act to authorize and require an extension of the street railway lines of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., and for other purposes.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., Wednesday, September 30, 1914) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 1, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 30 (legislative day of September 28), 1914.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Benjamin F. Bledsoe, of San Bernardino, Cal., to be United States district judge, southern district of California. (An additional position created by the act approved July 30, 1914.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

CAVALRY ARM.

Lieut. Col. Frederick S. Foltz, Cavalry, unassigned, to be colonel from September 27, 1914.

Lieut. Col. Harry C. Benson, Cavalry, unassigned, to be colonel from September 27, 1914, vice Col. Lloyd M. Brett, unassigned, detached from his proper command.

Maj. Robert A. Brown, Fourteenth Cavalry, to be lieutenant colonel from September 27, 1914, vice Lieut. Col. Grote Hutcherson, unassigned, detached from his proper command.

Capt. Elmer Lindsley, Cavalry, unassigned, to be major from September 27, 1914, vice Maj. Robert A. Brown, Fourteenth Cavalry, promoted.

First Lieut. John Alden Degen, Twelfth Cavalry, to be captain from September 27, 1914, vice Capt. Fred E. Buchan, Eighth Cavalry, detailed in the Quartermaster Corps.

Second Lieut. Robert C. Rodgers, Fourth Cavalry, to be first lieutenant from September 27, 1914, vice First Lieut. John Alden Degen, Twelfth Cavalry, promoted.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Rev. Haywood Lewis Winter, of Texas, to be chaplain with the rank of first lieutenant, from September 28, 1914, vice Chaplain Samuel H. Bell, First Field Artillery, retired from active service November 15, 1913.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. John J. Hannigan to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1914.

Lieut. (Junior Grade) William H. Lee to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1914.

Don F. Cameron, a citizen of Indiana, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 23d day of September, 1914.

Sydney Walker, Jr., a citizen of Illinois, to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps of the Navy from the 24th day of September, 1914.

First Lieut. Arthur Stokes to be a captain in the Marine Corps, to fill a vacancy occurring June 9, 1914, and to take rank from May 6, 1914.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 30 (legislative day of September 28), 1914.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

Augustus N. Hand to be United States district judge, southern district of New York.

POSTMASTERS.

KANSAS.

Thomas C. Rodgers, Beloit.
Inez E. Smith, Robinson.
B. F. Tatum, Kinsley.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Martin M. Judge, Webster.

VIRGINIA.

Gordon E. Gilly, Big Stone Gap.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, September 30, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit whose life-giving rays permeate all space and whose love reaches out to all mankind, we thank Thee for the strong, intelligent, ever-growing faith which recognizes Thee as Father of all souls, enhances, dignifies, and ennobles life, takes away the fear of death, fills the heart with eternal hope, accentuates the sinfulness of sin, and inspires to holy living. Grant, O most merciful Father, that it may continue to grow, that Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting an editorial from the Washington Herald, and comment thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HULL] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following letter:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C., September 30, 1914.

The Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to inform you that I have tendered to the governor of Maryland my resignation as a Representative in the Sixty-third Congress of the United States from the first congressional district of Maryland, to take effect on this date.

Very respectfully,

J. HARRY COVINGTON.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, the morning papers have the statement that the House is expected to take a recess or adjourn early next week. I think it is only fair to the House and the country to say that, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules, I have been authorized to report a rule on the ship-purchase bill and instructed to present that rule immediately after the completion of the Philippine legislation. In my last conference with the President, which I think is perfectly fair for me to state to the House, he insisted that he was very anxious for this bill to be taken up for consideration, and urged me to call the Committee on Rules together at the earliest practicable date, which was done; and they acted on the special rule. That special rule is now in my hand, and just as soon as the Philippine legislation is out of the way, I desire to inform the House I shall present the special rule to take up for consideration the ship-purchase bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. For immediate consideration?

Mr. MANN. For this evidence of Democratic harmony we are truly thankful.

Mr. HENRY. It is harmony. There is no trouble about it.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union automatically—

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, before we proceed I would like to extend my remarks in the Record by adding a few more words.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks leave to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject about which he was speaking. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understood the gentleman asked leave to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of whether we were going to have the shipping bill or not. We are all much interested in the subject of whether we get away or not. Why can not the gentleman give us the information instead of making us read it at some future time in the Record?

Mr. HENRY. The information bears upon the pending legislation, and I have prepared a statement for the Record, and it will throw light on the very subject the gentleman asks about.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think we are entitled to that information now.

Mr. HENRY. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. I know, but the gentleman only had two minutes and he used that up.

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas have five minutes in which to address the House. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Clerk to read the statement that I have prepared.

The Clerk read as follows:

"We should not think of adjourning Congress at this crisis. In the first place, only yesterday the southern governors, many Senators and Representatives resolutely determined in a historic conference in the Senate Office Building to 'make every possible effort to secure Federal legislation which will enable the producers of cotton to obtain loans of public funds to be deposited in banks at a reasonable rate of interest to be fixed by the Government,' and so forth.

"Hence, southern Senators and Representatives must keep faith and make a determined fight for this legislation. If they do not, they can not go home and look their people in the face with the cotton industry, our great international product, utterly prostrated and the market completely paralyzed.

"Second. We should pass the ship-purchase bill. This is one of the most far-reaching, beneficial, and glorious measures yet proposed by the President. It will rescue our commerce, manufactures, and agricultural exports from the most merciless, cruel, and grinding shipping trust and monopoly on the high seas the world ever saw. By the prompt establishment of this merchant marine it will bring countless blessings and benefits to our export manufactures, products of the field and farm, and commerce in general, by breaking the strangle hold of the piratical masters of the sea, who dominate rates on the high seas throughout the universe by their 'conferences,' agreements, and conspiracies to monopolize in freight charges.

"Third. We should pass the three important bills reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency and passed by the Senate, to wit, S. 6398, S. 6505, and H. R. 15038, so that the Federal reserve act may be speedily put in operation for the benefit of business and the relief of the distressed people throughout the South.

"Fourth. We should speedily pass the boiler-inspection bill, H. R. 17894, an emergency measure, and thus save thousands of lives on the railroads. This bill has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and the Rules Committee has authorized a special rule for its consideration.

"There are some other important matters that should be passed. These things are of more importance to the masses of people than the political fortunes of a few men or any set of men.

"Therefore, I shall resist adjournment until these matters are disposed of and fight to the death for action that will relieve the suffering and sorely distressed people of the cotton-growing States, which constitute about one-third the area and population of the Union."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask what this rule for the consideration of the shipping bill provides as to the debate, and so forth?

Mr. HENRY. Of course, we can not take it up now. It is authorized to be reported. It provides for eight hours' general debate and for unlimited right of amendment and discussion under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HENRY. I will.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman tell us when the boiler-inspection bill was passed? Was not that passed 10 years ago?

Mr. HENRY. This is extending the act.

Mr. MADDEN. This is extending it?

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman is on a cold trail about that. It is a very important measure.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman seems to be on quite a hot trail.

Mr. HENRY. I think not. Just the usual procedure as to the business of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the shipping bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the shipping bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Wait until the Chair puts the question. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] to make that seven minutes in order that I may yield five minutes of the time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COVINGTON], who has a message not political and in which we may all be interested.

Mr. MADDEN. I might ask to make it 10, so that I may have 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. How is the gentleman going to yield the time of the gentleman from Illinois? He asked two minutes in which to address the House.

Mr. BARNHART. I asked it in order that he might yield it to Mr. COVINGTON.

The SPEAKER. He can not yield it to Mr. COVINGTON.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Wait a moment. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, all I desire to do is to ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] whether he is prepared this morning to make any statement to the House on the probability of adjournment or taking any other procedure by which Members may shortly go home?

Mr. HENRY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Was the gentleman addressing his remarks to me?

Mr. MANN. I was not. I was addressing the old leader of the majority side of the House.

Mr. HENRY. I disclaim any right to leadership.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Why, Mr. Speaker, if the House will permit me, I will answer the gentleman's question. I would like to make a pact, if it is possible, that would let the House get away for a few weeks before election. So far as I am concerned, I would be glad to do so; but the gentleman from Illinois understands, of course, that a pact of that kind can only be made by unanimous consent, and until this side of the House is determined to live up to a pact of that kind and that side of the House is also willing to do so there is no chance for the gentleman from Illinois and myself to make an agreement. If the time arrives in the near future when the sentiment on both sides of the aisle is prepared to enter into a pact and live up to it, so far as I am concerned I shall be very glad to live up to it.

Mr. MANN. I made the inquiry in view of the statement of the gentleman from Alabama yesterday morning, to see if anything had eventuated that would be of interest to the House to know.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say candidly that if the ship bill is taken up and a rule is considered we shall probably not get away much before election, if at all. I shall be glad to support a rule on the shipping bill and support the bill; but I would be entirely willing and glad to have the rule on the shipping bill considered and the consideration of that bill go over until after election, because I think it could be delayed to that extent without any serious harm. I realize the necessity of gentlemen on both sides of the House going to their districts, if possible, but I do not think the situation is such that we can make an agreement now; but I hope that maybe the situation will clear itself up in a few days, and if it does I shall be glad to endeavor to make a pact with the gentleman from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. METZ, Mr. HENRY, and Mr. ADAMSON rose.

IMPORTATION OF CHEMICALS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. METZ] is recognized.

Mr. METZ. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to state the condition of the international chemical situation to-day for the benefit of those who are interested, so that they may inform their constituents from whom they get inquiries, and there are a lot of them.

The German Government has consented to give us all the chemicals we need of every kind, except that they have put an embargo on raw materials for dyestuff making. They impose two conditions: First, that we shall guarantee not to furnish these chemicals to any nation with which they are at war; and, second, that we shall transport them in American vessels.

That is, they do not want to take the risk of shipping these goods with the idea that they are for America and then have them exported to other countries. They promise that we shall get them if we send over American vessels in which to transport them.

Such vessels can be had and sent over, and in that way our mills can be kept supplied with the necessary chemicals, and we can get all we need from Germany. Under these conditions, if we send American vessels to Rotterdam, the vessels can be loaded and the chemicals and dyes brought here.

There is to be a conference at the State Department at 3 o'clock this afternoon for the purpose of taking up this question with the representatives of the textile, mining, and agricultural interests.

There have been a lot of reports, scattered around by people who do not know anything about the matter, as to the manufacturers who can make these goods here and the Swiss manufacturers. But the fact remains that we, as well as the Swiss, English, and French manufacturers, must all get our raw materials from Germany, and whether or not we shall ever be able to make these goods here is academic, in view of the fact that we want them now to keep our mills going.

We want Germany's chemicals and Germany wants our cotton, and it is up to us to get it there.

The conference, held at the office of the Secretary of the Interior on September 3, resulted in a memorandum being issued, which I offer herewith, together with my suggestions thereon:

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
September 3, 1914.

Two definite suggestions were made at the conference held by Secretary Lane to-day with about 25 representatives of the leading manufacturers of coal-tar, chemical, and pharmaceutical products:

First. That there should be a system instituted in this country similar to the one in England, whereby if a foreign patent is not used and manufactured within a reasonable time it will be opened to use by American manufacturers.

Second. A law should be passed whereby unfair competition will be cut off. This relates to the practice known as "dumping." This would preclude the practice, which it is alleged is now followed, of selling foreign products below the costs of manufacture.

It was pointed out that on account of foreign monopoly, aspirin, for instance, sells in this country for 32 cents an ounce, whereas abroad it sells for 42 cents per pound.

The statement was also made that about 20 per cent of the aniline dyes used in the United States are produced here, but from intermediate material, which is largely imported, although we have an abundant supply of coal tar; that there is only about a three-months' supply of dyestuffs in this country; and that the manufacturers in Germany have a supply on hand that would last this country for about a year if it could be procured; that most of the processes for the manufacture of dyestuffs are open to use in this country, but German patents preclude the manufacture here of many medicinal preparations; that many of these patents are being used as they expire; that products covered by foreign patents which have now expired are selling by the pound for what they sold by the ounce before the expiration of the patents.

It was thought by all the representatives of the manufacturers present that it was not profitable to go into the business, for the reason that a demand could not be secured for a sufficient amount of American dyestuffs with open foreign competition. The textile representatives stated that this was due to the fact that they could purchase dyestuffs manufactured abroad cheaper than they could purchase the same material in America. Secretary Lane asked if it was not possible to secure capital to invest in manufacturing plants if the users of dyestuffs would get together and give the manufacturers sufficient business. This was answered by the statement that it was impracticable and even impossible to get the users of dyestuffs to enter into such an agreement on account of the change of styles, the different materials required, and the uncertainty of demand, which would preclude the placing of orders for a period of several years.

The Secretary was requested to use his efforts through the State Department to secure permission for the exportation of dyestuffs from Germany on condition that the moneys needed were furnished. One of the far-reaching suggestions of the conference was that the wisest way to develop a great coal-tar product industry in the United States as exists in Germany was for the Government to establish a Government plant whose primary purpose should be the making of nitroderivatives of coal tar and other materials needed for explosives by the War and Navy Departments. This plant could experiment in processes which would become public property and be the foundation for private enterprise. The startling statement was made that the United States to-day was absolutely dependent on Germany for some of the essential elements in smokeless powder, and that if Germany stopped their manufac-

ture or prohibited export to this country we would be helpless. In time of war we could not supply our own war materials, even though the very raw materials from which they come were exported from the United States.

HON. FRANKLIN K. LANE,

Secretary of the Interior, Washington, D. C.

NEW YORK, September 26, 1914.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Referring to my recent call on you, and the conference with the manufacturers of coal-tar chemical and pharmaceutical products had at your office, permit me, in order to add to the record, to make the following remarks upon the memorandum, dated September 3, which your department issued and of which you gave me a copy.

First. In regard to the English system compelling the working of a patent, Germany provides in her patent law that a patent must be worked, but an exception is made in the case of American patents, and this exception was made at the request of the United States and is the subject of a treaty with Germany. There are so many more American patents, on machinery especially, taken out by Americans in Germany that the preponderance of interest is entirely on the side of the United States in not having the working clause enforced. England has such a working clause, which resulted, so far as chemicals and dyestuffs are concerned, in compelling large German plants—at least two of them—to erect plants in England in which the essential features of the patents are carried out; small quantities of the goods are made, but in all cases from raw material obtained from Germany from the original plants of the patentees. These patents, of course, are owned by English companies under the English law, but it is fair to assume that the stock control is in the German plants, either directly or indirectly.

Since the war broke out I have had telegrams from England and letters from the managers of these plants stating that they were compelled to shut down for lack of raw material, and asking if we could supply them from the United States either with the finished products or with the raw materials necessary to run their plants. England, in spite of its patent law, is therefore in a worse position than the United States, so far as these products are concerned. There are comparatively few of them, but they are very essential in various industries and also for the public health.

Second. "Unfair competition" is a general statement that covers largely the excuse of the man who is not able to compete. There is no "dumping" of German products, so far as chemical products are concerned, in the United States, because we are compelled to pay duty upon the "market value abroad," and the customhouse very soon raises invoices that do not come up to the market value, and a penalty falls upon the importer. Importers are not selling goods at a loss simply to dispose of the surplus stock of Germany, and even if such a condition did exist, no one knows better than the makers of the dyestuffs themselves, who, besides manufacturing a limited amount of colors in this country from raw materials imported from abroad, import very largely the finished product, that undervaluation or "dumping" is entirely out of the question and that none of the foreign manufacturers are selling their products below cost of manufacture. These domestic manufacturers have a 30 per cent protection under the present tariff. They haven't had less than that in 30 years. Under the Payne bill they succeeded in having a large number of intermediate products and raw materials, which formerly paid 20 per cent, placed upon the free list. These intermediate products or raw materials are really the basis of an industry, and upon them depends the development of the color industry in the United States.

Under the Underwood tariff most of these intermediate products or raw materials were put back on the dutiable list, with duties varying from 10 per cent to 20 per cent, for the very purpose of encouraging the production of benzole and the intermediate products derived therefrom. Practically nothing has been done, but aniline oil, betanaphthol, and some other products which were formerly free and are now paying duty are being sold in the markets of the world, not only in the United States but everywhere else, below the price at which they were sold before these duties went into effect, and the manufacturers abroad are not complaining about doing business at a loss on them even at the present time.

It was pointed out that on account of patent restriction "aspirin, for instance, sells in this country for 32 cents an ounce, whereas abroad it sells for 42 cents per pound." This is a shining example of conditions just exactly as they exist, because, in the first place, aspirin is covered by an American patent; the patent is owned by an American company and is practically the only one of all the coal-tar medicinal products, excepting phenacetine and acetanilid, that is made in the United States. It is made in Albany, at the plant of the Hudson River Aniline Co., which is in close affiliation if not actually controlled by the Farbenfabriken vorm. Friedrich Bayer & Co., of Germany, the original patentees of phenacetine and aspirin. The duty on aspirin is 25 per cent, and since the patents abroad expired there have been constant suits for patent infringement on stuff brought in in violation of the American patent. A patent is a monopoly granted for the product patented, and the American manufacturers have spent and are spending thousands and thousands of dollars protecting their rights against the infringing product from abroad. Therefore, quoting aspirin is entirely wide of the mark, has no bearing on the case whatever, for it is essentially a product patented in America, owned by an American company, and being manufactured by an American factory in Albany, N. Y. Practically the only product of this group on which the price was raised when the war began was aspirin. None of the German proprietary products were raised or have been raised up to the present time more than to simply cover the extra cost of transportation and war risk.

Aspirin was advanced 50 per cent because salicylic acid, from which it is made, went up 100 per cent in price; and when the supply in hand is exhausted no more can be produced, because it is made from crystal carboxylic acid produced only in England and Germany. It is contraband of war and under embargo in both countries against exportation. The result will be that the aspirin people will have to get their supplies from Germany instead of making it here if it is to continue in this market.

The statement that "20 per cent of aniline dyes used in the United States are made here" may be correct if the volume in pounds and not in values is considered, and only aniline colors as such and no alizarines nor the derivatives of anthracene or alizarine, indigo, and other coal-tar colors are considered.

The betanaphthol, paranitraniline, and similar intermediate products also used directly by the textile mills for producing color on the fiber must be eliminated in such a calculation. It covers mainly nigrosines used for leather and for shoe blacking in large quantities, soluble blues, magenta, and a few products used largely by the paper mills, alkali

blues and eosines used in paints and inks, all of which are the simplest of aniline colors to produce, but it is possible to make them only because of the free raw materials or the low rate of duty thereon and the 30 per cent protection on the finished product. Undoubtedly many products, after the patent expires, are sold by the pound at a price that formerly ruled for the ounce. This is not unusual for goods made in Germany only, but it can be truthfully stated of goods made anywhere else, including even the United States. That is how the inventor and patentee reimburses himself for the outlay, trouble, and study which the invention caused him and which every Government realizes under its patent law that he shall be entitled to the benefit of for a certain number of years in return for acquainting the world at large with the method of carrying out his invention. The fundamental product, of course, after all, in the discussion of coal-tar chemicals and dyestuffs is benzole, which is produced here by the Coal Tar Products Co. and the Barrett Manufacturing Co., who are in close affiliation. I have been told by their representatives that it would take them from 18 months to 2 years to construct plants to increase their supply of benzole. They produce enough now to take care of our present requirements on this side and produce just enough aniline oil, the next stage in the process of color making, to meet their contracts now in force, and no more. The German Government had given permission to export dyestuffs. They were coming in freely until it was ascertained that some of them were reexported to Canada and England, and I have a strong suspicion and reason to believe that one of the gentlemen most active in the conference held in your office had agreed to act as a go-between for Canadian manufacturers desirous of obtaining German dyestuffs to keep their mills going. Undoubtedly these manufacturers will see to it that the English mills with which they are affiliated will also get the necessary supplies if they can be obtained in this way. But there are much graver conditions in this situation than simply the dyestuff industry, although that is far-reaching.

The production of cyanides—largely used by mining interests, the potash used for fertilizers, etc.—are all controlled practically by Germany. These goods could have all been shipped to us down the Rhine, via Rotterdam, by steamers of the Holland-American Line, and a quantity of colors sufficient to run the country for another four to six weeks has come in that way since the war began. There were rumors, however, that England would seize these supplies and keep them for herself, even though she had to pay for them in a prize court. Whether or not these remarks had effect upon the situation, the German Government a few days ago placed an embargo on all chemicals of every nature and description unless they could be transported to the United States in American vessels under the American flag. As soon as such vessels are provided we can get all we need, and not only dyestuffs but cyanide and potash as well may be exported to this country.

There is to be a conference on Wednesday at the State Department in regard to this matter, and undoubtedly steps will be taken to furnish American bottoms to bring these much-needed products into this country. Incidentally, it may be well to call attention to the fact also that the exportation of all raw materials and intermediate products that can be used for color making has been absolutely prohibited by the German Government, undoubtedly for fear that these products might find their way back to England and thus help supply the English textile industry.

I realize, of course, we have no interest in the industries of England, Germany, or any other country excepting our own. There is no reason why we can not keep our own supplied if we do not pay too much attention to the few who want to take advantage of this crisis to further their own lines at the sacrifice of thousands and thousands of mills and other consumers who need the products, and upon obtaining which the prosperity of this country so largely depends.

Just one point more: If all these things can be brought about, if we could compel the carrying out of patents in this country, if we could compel manufacturing here, the result would be the same as in England. The large German plants with their experience would simply duplicate their own plants here on a small scale, just enough to comply with the law, and would make the American consumer pay for the amortization of these plants during the life of the patent, and the first time trouble arose we would be in the same position we are now, because no one would make raw materials and products not patented on a losing basis in competition with those who could beat them at least 100 per cent at any time.

The labor involved in chemical industry is very small. It is the smallest item of all, so we would not gain much for "labor" by establishing chemical plants in this country. There are a great many more men employed in the merchandising of chemicals than there are in making them, and always will be.

Yours, very truly,

HERMAN A. METZ.

ADDRESS OF JUDGE COVINGTON.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House hear the gentleman from Maryland, Judge COVINGTON, for five minutes. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COVINGTON] may address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COVINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as the letter of resignation read a few moments ago from the Clerk's desk indicates, this is the last day of my service in the House of Representatives. I would have been quite content modestly to retire without uttering a single word at the time of my departure if I did not feel so deep a sense of gratitude, which I now desire briefly to express, for the very generous and more than merited praise which my colleagues on both sides of this Chamber have expressed for me and my work on this floor. The genuineness and warmth of those expressions have deeply touched me, and I shall always cherish them as of my brightest memories.

Mr. Speaker, I leave this body with a great sense of humbleness, because I have come to realize what service in it really means. We know theoretically about the great coordinate

branches of the Federal Government. We know that its Legislature contains another body at the opposite end of the Capitol, but we also know that Anglo-Saxon liberty has always had its bulwark in the great popular assembly of the whole people. From the time when the great charter was wrested from King John on the green field of Runnymede, the progress of English liberty has simply kept pace with the increasing power of the House of Commons. Here in the United States, from the day of the Articles of Confederation to the present time, the basic structure of our institutions has been our popular assembly. The Senate is a great body, with certain high constitutional prerogatives, but its incorporation in the Constitution as a section of our National Legislature was the result of compromise made essential by the conditions surrounding the framers of the Constitution. In a time of great popular upheaval it might be abolished and the solid framework of our Government would remain unimpaired. The title and the constitutional prerogatives of our Chief Magistrate might be altered; the organization of our judicial system might be radically reconstructed without the constitutional liberty of the American people being in the slightest infringed upon. But you can never change the essential form or lessen the power of the House of Representatives and maintain unimpaired the freedom and happiness of our people. This Government in its majesty, with the Stars and Stripes as its glorious emblem of blood-bought liberty, will stand as a monument and guide to freedom in the world just so long as the House, in its full constitutional power of to-day, with each individual Member therein representative of and responsible to a great constituency of citizens, remains the keystone of the Government.

And so in leaving I can not say that I regard it as a promotion to go from the House of Representatives to the Federal bench. The legislature and the bench are fields apart in our coordinate scheme of government, and men will constantly go from one to the other of them; but no man, in assuming an appointive judicial position, no matter how high, can fairly say that he has been promoted from the post he has thrice occupied in this House as the representative by their suffrages of 200,000 freemen.

Mr. Speaker, in departing from these seats of the mighty—for it is a mighty place—the happiest thought one can have, the greatest source of gratification, is the thought that he will be able truthfully to tell his fellow citizens that there is much less of narrow and offensive partisanship and a great deal more of lofty patriotism among the Members of this House than the public are wont to believe. Ours is a government by political parties. They were really first organized of necessity in this country in the Congress. Citizens differ in opinion as to what is best for the States, and a political party is the organism which, with straightforward and unquestionable power, with fixed purpose and the collective force of masses of the people, can make effective the primary opinions upon which certain masses agree. But at any critical moment in the Nation's history in this House it may well be said, "There none were for the party and all were for the State."

It has been glorious to know the broad catholicity of the Members of this House. Friendships do not follow party lines, and I shall always remember most gratefully the cordial fellowship which I have had with the members of the party to which I am opposed as well as with my own political associates.

Mr. Speaker, I observed a few days ago that the genial gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HUGHES] was engaged in the pastime of making a presidential candidate for 1916. I imagine that, belonging to the party to which he does, he was engaged in a chimerical performance, perhaps trying to extract sunbeams from political snowballs. But, seriously, Mr. Speaker, if by some strange revolution of politics the now minority party shall have even a chance to elect a President, I know of no one of its members so fit as the great minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Whatever of good record his party has before the people to-day is due to his industry and keen political acumen in this House. His party will honor itself in honoring him with the nomination for the Presidency. [Applause.] Of course, I hope it will be only an empty honor, but an honor well deserved nevertheless.

As a parting word, I thank the Members of this House from the depths of my heart for the constant courtesy and consideration they have accorded me since the day I first came here, and I leave this Chamber and its inspiring associations with genuine regret. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carr, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the

bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. MYERS, Mr. PITTMAN, and Mr. SMOOR as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3550) ratifying the establishment of the boundary line between the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY—REVISION OF PRINTING LAWS.

The SPEAKER. This being Calendar Wednesday, the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of H. R. 15902, to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications, with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in the Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of H. R. 15902, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose on last Wednesday an amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] was pending, to strike out the paragraph relating to the method of allotting documents to Members.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, as this is probably the most important paragraph in the bill, I would like to enter into an arrangement with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good], if he is present, as to time, so that we may go into this matter fully for the information of all.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] has just stepped out, and is not in the Chamber at this moment.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Illinois feel that he can enter into an agreement as to the time?

Mr. MANN. I expect to speak in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good]. I do not know who will want to be heard in favor of the motion.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 30 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I think Members will want more time than that.

Mr. MADDEN. Make it an hour.

Mr. BARNHART. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to strike out the paragraph be closed in one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending amendment be confined to one hour.

Mr. MANN. One-half of the time in favor, and one-half opposed.

Mr. BARNHART. One-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] or whomsoever he may designate, and one-half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. One half the time to be used by those who favor the amendment, and the other half by those who are opposed to it.

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether that agreement applies only to the first paragraph of section 68, ending with line 4, on page 77?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. It does not apply to the balance of that section?

Mr. BARNHART. No.

Mr. MANN. No; only to that paragraph.

Mr. BARNHART. Only the first paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire if there is anyone on the other side who would now like to use any of the time?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good] is not here, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is going to speak in opposition to the motion.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, for the information of those present on both sides of the House who may not have examined this paragraph carefully I want to state briefly, and as fairly and fully as I can, so that all may understand, that this is the paragraph in the bill that provides for changing the present method of allotting documents to Members of Congress, substituting a valuation plan for the present system. That is, instead of allotting all sorts of documents to each Member of Congress hereafter, if the provisions of this bill are adopted, an allotment, not in money but in publications, will

be given to each Member, and he may draw against that valuation or that allotment any document which he cares to use. Furthermore—

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Would that include the farmers' bulletins?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; it includes the farmers' bulletins. And in this connection I want to state briefly that not only the present Committee on Printing but several former committees who have gone before have unanimously agreed that something of this sort is really necessary to give the people of the several congressional districts of the country what they really want, and yet effect a great saving in the matter of the publication of documents. The gentleman from Illinois referred to farmers' bulletins. I want to explain in that connection that for the past 10 years the cost of the farmers' bulletins, 12,500 to each district, has been, according to the size of the publication and the number of pages, from \$191 to \$205 each year to each congressional district. Now, it has been discovered that many Members of Congress have not used the farmers' bulletins—that 30 Members did not draw any bulletins at all in one session of Congress, and there became an accumulation of 3,000,000 copies in the Agriculture Department, where they have lain until many have become practically obsolete. That is for the reason that scientific research has progressed since the publication of the bulletin whereby that makes such publications absolutely worthless to anyone.

The provision of the present bill is that you may have \$1,800 in document value, and you may draw it all out in farmers' bulletins if you see fit, or if you do not need any bulletins in your district you can have it in horse books or cattle books or yearbooks or geological surveys and a thousand and one things set forth in the pamphlet which has been mailed to each Member of the House setting forth the wide range of publications.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman inform the committee as to the total estimated cost of the publications that are usually received during the year by a Member of Congress as compared with the basis proposed by the committee?

Mr. BARNHART. The average cost of allotment to Members has been, in the 10 years past, some \$1,500 to \$1,550 to each Member. This new provision will give \$1,600.

Mr. STAFFORD. That \$1,500 average includes the farmers' bulletins?

Mr. BARNHART. No; it does not. We have allowed \$1,600 in value for the publications that you have been receiving through the folding room and added \$200 to that for farmers' bulletins, which makes the total of \$1,800.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I would like to inquire how the price is arrived at for the Yearbook, say? It is proposed to publish 470,000, and in the report they are figured at \$1 apiece. I think they can be purchased for a good deal less than that.

Mr. BARNHART. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for asking the question. The Agricultural Yearbook under the present proposition will not carry the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture. That is really an official report. We will thereby reduce the cost of the total publication \$16,000, and the reports will still be available to anybody that wants them by asking the department for them. The Yearbook has cost by actual competition anywhere from 60 cents to 97 cents. To that has been added 10 per cent, as it is on all publications, to cover the expense of wrapping, storage, and so forth, and that 10 per cent this bill proposes to remove.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana has occupied five minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. I would like five minutes more. The Yearbook will cost, it has been estimated under this plan, with the elimination of the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, something like 50 cents a copy. There will be no addition of 10 per cent. The cost of the horse book will be about 40 cents a copy, and there will be a reduction, provided the size of the volume remains the same, of 10 per cent from that, which will bring it to about 36 cents a copy. The cattle book will cost about 36 cents per copy, and the farmers' bulletins cost on an average a cent and a quarter apiece, and not 5 cents, at which the Government sells them, because there is the expense of mailing, wrapping, and stationery, which in order to keep the office whole had to be added to the cost.

The prices fixed have been established so as to protect the Printing Office against loss. The committee believes, the Senate

committee believes, the Joint Committee on Printing believes, and every committee that has ever investigated the abuses and every committee that has had anything to do with it, without regard to politics, believes that for the benefit of the membership of the House, for the efficiency of the service to the people whom Members serve, and for the welfare of the Public Treasury, such a provision ought to be adopted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana, chairman of the committee, states to the House that the plan proposed would give to the people in the districts throughout the country such documents as they may be interested in. My experience is that the people throughout the country are interested in all the documents. They are not interested in any particular district in a given document. Let us suppose, for example, that if the plan in this bill shall be carried out that the 30,000 school children in my district ask for a map of the United States because they know that we have a given allotment made in value, what else can I do but to respond to those requests, and what would become of the other people interested in public documents? Some people want one kind of a document, other people want another. But let us assume that any given number of children in the public schools had made up their minds that they wanted a map of the United States, and the fever for that map should spread throughout every school in the district, and that each one should request to be supplied with it.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. What do these people do now when they ask for more maps than the gentleman has to dispose of?

Mr. MADDEN. Everybody knows that each Member has an allotment of a certain number of documents of a given kind. Under the proposition of this committee everybody would be advised that a certain amount of money corresponding to the value of a certain number of documents had been placed to the credit of each Member of Congress. All anyone would have to do would be to form a combination in any given district to get a given kind of document, and a Member of Congress would be powerless to refuse to send that document as long as he had any to his credit from which to send it. That would leave him in the embarrassing position of not being able to supply the varied information of the Government activities. The women everywhere are interested in farmers' bulletins. The men are also interested in them. They want to know what recommendations the Agricultural Department makes on all the different topics studied by that department. Lots of people are interested in yearbooks. Veterinary surgeons, students at veterinary colleges, are interested in horse books and cattle books. Engineers and scientists are interested in the geological surveys. All kinds of people, thinking in all kinds of ways, want the information that fits their particular case, and to-day Members are permitted to extend to these people all privileges which the Government affords by sending them the particular documents, to the extent of their allotment, which the people request. But give notice to the public that Members are allotted a certain value in documents, and let the public come to believe that their request for a given document will be responded to, and they may take out all of your allotment in one document, and the result will be that all the rest of the people in the territory represented by a Member of Congress will have to make their requests in vain. To-day Members are able to supply the needs of the people according to their varied thoughts and their interest in Government activities, and this amendment ought not to be voted down. On the contrary, it ought to be adopted.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a very important bill, and the section sought to be stricken out is the very vitals of the entire measure. I do not think that the amendment ought to prevail at all, and I believe it is up to every Member here to study carefully this amendment before he casts a vote upon it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who just preceded me, struck the keynote, namely, that every district, or practically every district, desires its own peculiar literature. For that very reason the amendment ought not to carry. It ought not to obtain. I am not at all afraid of an onslaught being made upon me by the people of my district demanding a certain kind of literature that will exhaust my quota. I have never yet found the people of my district unreasonable. When I have told them that I did not have books to my credit they have accepted my statement. I have scores and scores of publications to my credit that I am ready now to turn over to any Member upon the floor of the House who wants them. In the seven years that I have served in this House I think I have had but two demands for geological bulletins. Yet I have a tremendous number of them to my credit. They are down here in the folding room or some place else—I do not know where—

taking up room, and they are of no use, no value to me, and there is no demand for them in my district whatever. But I happen to have an agricultural district. The demand upon me for agricultural yearbooks is tremendous, and I am unable to supply it. Seven years ago when I came to Congress I invested several dollars, merging into the early hundreds of dollars, in agricultural yearbooks. I paid that money out of my own pocket until I probably had stored away in the folding room some six or seven thousand yearbooks, going back to the year 1903. Since that period of time I have been substantially able to meet the demands of my people for agricultural yearbooks; but had I not adopted that plan, I could not have begun to supply the demand. I have a tremendous demand for agricultural bulletins. The State of Indiana two years ago enacted a law requiring agriculture to be taught in our public schools. To-day the teachers in my district are expecting thousands of farm bulletins from me, and it keeps me eternally going to Members of the House who come from cities, begging them for farm bulletins, and I have to exchange things which I have to meet that demand. I have an unprecedented demand for horse-doctor books and cattle-doctor books, and things like that. Those four things—the agricultural yearbooks, farm bulletins, the horse-doctor and the cattle-doctor books—are the four pieces of literature to which I have an unprecedented demand. So far as these large mounted maps are concerned, of course they are a nice present to send out occasionally to some one to whom you want to send something, but there is no real educational value in one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it is proper for one Member to take especial pride in any one piece of proposed legislation, but for many years I served on the Committee on Printing, and everyone knows that the work of that committee is largely a business proposition. I want to say that so far as the work of the committee extended during all of the years of my service upon it, which ended with the beginning of this Congress, politics cut small part in the deliberations of the committee. Generally speaking, the matters that came up were questions of business, and for about eight years there was a Joint Investigating Commission on Printing and a Joint Committee on Printing, as well as a Committee on Printing in both the House and the Senate. The first organization I mentioned has ceased its labors, but one of the purposes that the joint investigating commission had was to simplify the Government printing and to economize in all matters appertaining to that branch of the Government service. It has been correctly stated here by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], the chairman of the present Committee on Printing in the House, that it has been the unanimous opinion and finding of all those who have investigated the question of public printing, appointed of the House and Senate, that the old system of publishing so many thousands or hundreds of thousands of documents and then distributing those documents without regard to the subjects among the membership of the House and of the Senate on a pro rata was wrong in practice. My friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who spoke a moment ago, I think presented all of the arguments against this proposition, but I would like to ask him one or two questions. I know that he is a good business man, and I know that he is a good legislator, and I pay tribute to him for that; but I would like to ask him what is the necessity of giving to the people along the banks of the lower Mississippi bulletins that would interest the people of Nevada or some great mining section? What would be the use of giving to children in a city school many of the documents and bulletins that would properly interest children in a country school, in an entirely different section of the country, and, lastly, I would ask him this: Is it true that the school children of this country read and study all of the farm bulletins as textbooks in the public schools of this country? I know that they do not. I do know this, that occasionally a request is received from a particular school that a certain bulletin be sent to the teacher of that school or to a trustee of that school. A matter of interest contained in that bulletin it is supposed will be useful in the training and education of the children of that locality.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, how much more time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 11 minutes remaining and those who are favorable to the amendment have 25 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARNHART. Then I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman have charge of the time? I thought the Chair had charge of the time; but I do not care.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to continue for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of economy to the Government and will save to the Government hundreds of thousands of dollars a year. I have stated here before, and I do not care to repeat it now, that the work of the Joint Printing Investigating Commission and the Joint Committee on Printing and the Committees on Printing of the House and the Senate have saved to this Government more than a million dollars a year for years past. Now, as to distribution, a great deal has been said about the Yearbook. I have said that is a public document of such general information as to make it of large import. It is a fact that we have the same number of Yearbooks printed to-day that we had in 1895. It is also true that the membership of the House and the membership of the Senate have increased during that time, so that whereas in 1895 each Member of the House had a quota of 991 Yearbooks annually, to-day he has 812, and that is accounted for on the ground that the membership of the House has been increased so that we receive 179 less now. I may say, Mr. Chairman, what each Member here can say, that there are hundreds of public documents printed that do not interest the people I represent here on this floor. The purpose of this bill and the purpose of this provision that is under discussion here is to give to each Member of the House and Senate the publications which are of value to the people he represents. Why, only four years ago more than a million of public documents were sent to the junk heap, and I believe this year more than 900,000 copies were sent to the junk heap, because they were under the old system—because they were published under existing law. There was not a general demand for them, so they were piled up in the document room to the credit of the membership of the House and the Senate, but were not sent out to the public because the public do not want those publications. So, Mr. Chairman, I submit that one of the very wise and best provisions of this bill is that providing for the valuation and giving to the membership of the House and the Senate the right and privilege to say what particular documents they wish for the people they represent, and then they will be able to supply those on requests made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Illinois opposed to the amendment?

Mr. MANN. I am opposed to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry there are not more Members of the House present, not for the purpose of hearing me but in order that they might consider this proposition more for their own information. If it should become a law it is quite important, and if it should not the proposition is important. Under existing law there are certain publications published with an addition of a fixed number; various reports of departments, various reports of different governmental activities, and the old printing law provides for the publication of a fixed number. They are divided between the House and Senate folding rooms in addition to what we call the usual number, which goes to libraries, and so forth, and each Member of the House receives a certain number of those publications, not quite so many now, since we have increased the membership of the House, as it used to be when I first came to the House. Many of them are of no interest to the average citizen or the average Member of Congress. Most of those publications are wasted, no matter what is done with them. They are wasted if they are thrown in the wastebasket and equally wasted as a rule if they are sent to some constituent. We send out most of our publications, but very often a constituent does not feel at all flattered by receiving some technical scientific publication concerning something that he does not know the first thing about. And it may not always be practical to send to people who do know about them. We all endeavor to do the best we can in that way. Now, the proposition pending before us is to give each Member a certain credit with the Government Printing Office, and whenever any publication is published within a certain list of considerable length named in the bill that then the Member of Congress can take just as many copies of that publication as he pleases, so that he does not exceed his credit balance at the Government Printing Office. Under that a man can take Smithsonian Institution reports or American Historical Society reports, or the

Yearbook of agricultural reports of such number as he pleases within his limit. Now, to-day we get the Yearbook, which is very popular and which we get in large numbers. In addition to that we get the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, which is purely statistical and practically of no interest to the average citizen, and I doubt whether many Members of Congress send them out unless they send them out thinking they are Yearbooks, which they are not, but under the system proposed as a Member examines the documents which are issued he will get his quota of those documents, fixing the number that he himself wants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TRIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Illinois have leave to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Then we often order published a document to be placed to our credit in the folding room, like the horse book, the cow book, the cookbook some time ago, various things of that sort, and I am inclined to think that this system, if adopted, will lead to the ordering of various documents of that kind to be printed which are of interest to the people, instead of publishing a lot of documents, as we do now, that are of no interest to the people; and to me it seems the wiser plan, with the Government collecting a large amount of information, to publish the information in a form which will entertain and instruct the people whom we represent.

I understand there are some dangers in this proposition as a matter of convenience. One danger is that it will be represented that a Member of Congress receives an allowance of \$1,800 in addition to his present salary and his present mileage and his present stationery account. Well, I do not think that will cut very much figure. There is another difficulty that will arise. Now, when a constituent reads in a public paper that a certain document has been issued which he can get by writing to his Member of Congress, he writes to the Member of Congress. He does not know what the document is nine times out of ten; does not want it, and has no use for it, but he thinks he can get something for nothing, and he writes for it. If a number of papers in your district have carried a statement of that sort, you may get 50 requests when you have only four documents. What do you do? You write a courteous letter and tell him your quota is exhausted, and if you are able to get it by trading or otherwise, for any other matter, you will get it and send to him. I assume that is what Members do, because that is the sensible thing to do. You are doing the best you can, but under this system if somebody starts a report in the paper that a popular document has been printed which he can get by writing to his Member of Congress, and you get a thousand requests for it, you can not say your quota is exhausted, because, if you do, they would not believe you. They know you have a credit to begin with of \$1,800, and they will think they are entitled to a share of it. A few years ago when the Smithsonian Institution got out one of its annual reports it furnished a newspaper statement to be printed in the press referring to that annual report as the "People's Own Book." I think that was the title, although I am not sure. It was something like that. And all over the country the city press and the country press published the statement that by writing to your Member of Congress you could get a most interesting document called the "People's Own Book." I think I got a thousand requests, and I had 8 copies, maybe 11, at that time. Well, that sort of thing may happen in the future. It may be embarrassing, but that is one of the chances we have to take. We have to take a chance also with the schools telling the school children to write for certain documents. You can send word into my district to the superintendent of half a dozen schools, and I will get a thousand or two thousand requests for anything within a week, coming from that, as has frequently happened to me in the past. We have to take the chances on that.

This scheme will not cost the Government any more. I doubt whether it will cost any less, but it will permit the Member of Congress to receive a document which is of interest to his constituents, which he can send to his constituent, knowing that the person who receives it will examine it, probably read it, receive both information and interest from the reading of it, and he is not required to send out the book in relation to how many ships there are, and the names of them, which his constituents in the inland do not want, or the report of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which his constituents in the inland do not want, or the report about subterranean waters out in Kansas, which they do not want in Illinois, or the geological survey of Colorado, which they do not want in South Caro-

lina. That is what we get now. So I am opposed to the amendment and in favor of the proposition in the bill as they have already modified it.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the opposition to the amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. BUTLER. I feared that, but I suppose I will not be disorderly if I make a simple statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there anyone who desires to be recognized as favoring the amendment?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] be permitted to proceed for five minutes, to be taken out of the hour's time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be allowed to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that this discussion does not have in it anything that is very exciting. I know that it does not involve contention, and therefore it gets but very little attention; but its subject involves, as I understand—and I would like the chairman of the committee, who is well informed, to give me his attention for a minute—something like a million of dollars' cost to the Government every year. Am I right about that?

Mr. BARNHART. About \$750,000 has been the average.

Mr. BUTLER. The purpose of the provision in the present bill is to enable Members to distribute public documents in a way, by a method, that will be more useful to our constituents? I had intended to bring into the House this morning the catalogue or list of public documents furnished to me by the department. You will remember names of the documents are found in a book or catalogue, and the documents are kept in the folding room. I am sorry I forgot to bring the catalogue with me. I should like to have read to the committee the long list of documents which I have not distributed, useless to my constituents, and, indeed, that I do not know where to send. I felt at first, when the gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of this committee, spoke to me of this provision that I could not vote for it, for reasons which other gentlemen have already discussed. But those reasons have disappeared, and I believe that this is a wise provision, and I believe that the committee should adopt it. I regret very greatly that Members have not seen fit to attend this session in order to consider it.

Take the eulogies, for instance. We grow fond of each other while in the service here. Our relations are agreeable generally, and when nature works its end with any of us, the going is filled with regret. What do our different constituents know about the humble and inconspicuous Member of Congress? They have no desire for an account of his service or history of his life, yet each Member has placed to his credit 15 or 20 eulogies, containing material interesting to only those who knew him—very expensive publications. I am very glad, indeed, to hand them over to the gentleman who happens to be returned from the district which the deceased Member represented in his lifetime. If you take up your list and examine it, together with what you have to your credit, you will find a great quantity of documents, I presume, that you will never use.

Here is the title of a document—Abridgment of Messages and Documents. What is that document, anyhow? What does it contain? I presume that I should know, but in 18 years' experience I have never had a constituent who asked for the Abridgment of Messages and Documents.

If I had the time, I could go through this long list and what I could say to you might be of some use, perhaps, because of my long experience in the House. A great mass of this material is of no use whatever to my constituents. I further illustrate: I live not far from the Delaware River—it runs by the side of my district—and those of my constituents who have motor boats and other water craft, and those who intend to own one, are properly anxious to have maps of the Coast and Geodetic Survey in order that they be comforted with the knowledge that they have the maps. [Laughter.] They are entitled to the maps, which belong to them. I have spent a good deal of my time hunting for those maps. I think I am regularly allotted 20. I think I supply about 300 or 400. I would like to have a chance to go and order them from the public document room, and that opportunity I shall get if the provision passes. I could illustrate for an hour.

I do not see where an argument can be made against the adoption of this provision, which seems to me so sensible. I presume that some of our constituents will say that we are going to help ourselves to \$1,800 extra pay. The gentleman from Illinois suggested that there would be some criticism to that effect.

I do not care for the fellow in my district who would say that of me. I can get along; I shall try to find a majority without him; and I do not fear the damage he would desire to create by his ignorant statement. Yet it will work to our disadvantage in one particular, that our constituents may feel that we, having an opportunity to obtain what they wish, ought to get it for them. As for me, I have made it a rule to get what my constituents wish to have, and therefore this misunderstanding will not conflict in any way with my happiness or my usefulness. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] may address the House on a matter apart from the bill, the time to come out of the hour's debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] may address the House on a matter apart from the bill, the time to come out of the hour's debate. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, what has this administration done for the State of Washington? We hear the constant boast that the Democratic Party since it came into power has written more constructive legislation upon the statute books than any other administration in the history of the Nation. These boastful orators make a slight mistake. What they mean is that this administration has passed more destructive legislation than any other in the history of this Nation. In a few short months this administration has destroyed confidence, paralyzed industry, closed mills and factories, created tramps and beggars, driven millions into idleness, and emptied the National Treasury. Destructive, and not constructive, legislation has ever been the height of Democratic accomplishment.

What has this administration done for Washington? The first thing that it did was to enact a tariff law. Lumber, shingles, fish, coal, lime, and practically all farm and dairy products were placed upon the free list. Immediately upon the enactment of this law mills and factories in the State of Washington began to close. Others began to run on short time. Men were thrown out of employment and wages were reduced. But in British Columbia, just across the international boundary line, mills began to open. They began to run 24 hours in a day. The Democratic tariff law closed our mills, it opened those of the foreigner; the Democratic tariff law took the work and wages from the American, it gave work and wages to the foreigner.

More shingles were brought into the United States from British Columbia in each of the months of June and July, 1914, than ever came into this country before in any one entire year. I select these two months in order that it can not be claimed that the European war had anything to do with the situation. The consumption of shingles in this country has not increased—in fact, it has decreased. So that the number of shingles that we have imported means just that much work and that much wages taken from the American citizen in the State of Washington and given to the Chinaman, the Jap, and the Hindu in British Columbia. The Government has lost the revenue that should have been collected on these shingles, but not a single human being has bought a shingle for a penny less since the new Democratic tariff law was enacted.

The lumber mills of Washington have run on short time. Some of the mills have closed. Many of the men formerly employed in them have been idle, and millions of feet of lumber have been imported. Again just that much wage taken from the American and given to the foreigner. The Government has lost the revenue and not a single American consumer has bought a foot of lumber for a penny less.

The new tariff law has almost destroyed the lime industry in the State of Washington. The output of our factories has been greatly reduced. Our import of lime has increased. We have been made the dumping ground for the lime produced in British Columbia. Many men have been thrown out of employment; the Government has lost the revenue. That much work and that much wages have been taken from the American and given to the foreigner, but no American consumer has bought a bushel of lime for a penny less.

Our great fishing industry, second in importance only to our timber industry, has been greatly injured by the new tariff law. Fish were placed upon the free list. Our industries have been compelled, without protection, to compete with the Government-subsidized fisheries of British Columbia. More fish have been imported into this country than formerly. That much wages

and that much work taken from the American fisherman and given to the foreigner. The Government has lost the revenue, but no American consumer has bought his fish for a penny less.

In western Washington alone, while thousands of men are out of employment and looking for work, while thousands of others are working on short time, the present Democratic tariff law each month has taken from the American workingman not less than \$3,000,000 and given it to the oriental labor in British Columbia. The Government has lost millions of dollars in revenue, the consumer has not paid less for his products, and no one has been benefited but the foreigner.

Surely the working people of Washington should rise up and call this administration blessed, that has taken the bread out of the mouths of their women and children and given it to the Jap, the Hindu, and the Chinaman.

NO RECIPROCITY.

Or many competitive articles produced in British Columbia we do not charge them the same tariff to sell in our market as they charge us on similar articles to sell in their market. This is true of many of our timber products, of lime and fish, and most agricultural articles. Why should we permit British Columbia to send her competitive products into our markets free when she compels us to pay to send the same products into her markets? Why should we let British Columbia send her lime into this country for less than she lets us send ours into her market? Yet we do this very thing. Why should we let British Columbia send her lumber into this country free when she places a tariff on ours? Why should the Washington farmer pay more to sell his fruit in British Columbia than the British Columbia farmer pays to sell his fruit in the Washington markets? Yet this is exactly what we do. We protested in vain against this injustice when the present Democratic tariff law was being written. We are taught to love our neighbor as ourselves; but to treat the foreigner better than he treats us is not altruistic, it is not good sense, it is blundering stupidity.

It is true that this administration has brought to the people of the State of Washington the inestimable privilege of buying eggs from China, of purchasing butter from New Zealand, of getting meat from Australia, and corn from Japan. The Government upon all these items has lost the revenue, and we are now asked to make up this deficiency by direct taxation. The foreigner has taken that much of the American market from the American producer, but the cost of living has not been reduced. For all these favors conferred by this administration the people of the State of Washington are duly thankful and will express their appreciation at the polls in November.

PANAMA CANAL.

And I have not catalogued all the blessings brought to my State by this administration. The Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore contained this plank:

We favor the exemption from toll of American ships engaged in coastwise trade passing through the canal.

The people of the State of Washington believed that the Democratic Party would keep that platform pledge. They had a right to believe it. President Wilson, then a candidate, specifically indorsed this plank of the platform. All Democratic candidates everywhere approved it. A Democratic Congress, after full and exhaustive debate, wrote this declaration into law. The Democratic platform further declared that "our pledges are made to be kept when in office." And President Wilson in one of his speeches when he was a candidate announced that the Democratic platform was not "molasses to catch flies."

Relying upon that platform promise, relying upon the promise of the Democratic candidate for President, relying upon the promises of all Democratic candidates for Congress everywhere, relying upon the solemn promise of the Democratic Party as written into law, the people of Seattle, of Tacoma, and other Puget Sound ports spent millions of dollars, and obligated themselves to spend millions of dollars more, preparing for the benefits that would come to our country by the opening of the Panama Canal.

Who will claim that the Democratic Party kept these promises? Who will claim that the Democratic candidates kept faith with the people? What candidate in any party in the State of Washington will dare to uphold the action of the Democratic Party in regard to the Panama Canal?

No man can point out where there was a single change in conditions from the day that the Baltimore platform was adopted, from the day when Mr. Wilson was nominated, from the day when he wrote his letter of acceptance, from the day when he made his speech approving the tolls plank in the platform, or when there was any other justification, for the Demo-

cratic Party, shamelessly and without explanation, cowardly and unpatriotically, betraying the people of the West and disregarding their interests and giving to British Columbia the great benefits of the canal that justly belonged to them. For this action there is but one reason. It was done to secure the influence of the great transcontinental railroads and to purchase the friendship of Great Britain.

This one act alone is sufficient to condemn the Democratic Party forever on the Pacific coast. It is the most brazen refutation of platform promises in the history of this Nation. If the Democratic Party can do this thing and live, then popular government is a failure. In view of this record of the Democratic Party, what is a Democratic promise worth? Who will hereafter believe a promise in a Democratic platform?

No wonder the real leaders in the Democratic Party, like CLARK, UNDERWOOD, FITZGERALD, KITCHIN, and DOREMUS, refused to stultify themselves and voted against the refutation of their platform and their promises. No wonder that Mr. UNDERWOOD called this action of his own party "un-American" and that Speaker CLARK denounced it as "unspeakable degradation." No American citizen in the State of Washington, in any party, will dare attempt to justify this action of the Democratic Party in regard to the Panama Canal.

The repeal of the Panama Canal act raised the freight rate on lumber from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic markets \$1.50 per thousand. This increase in freight rates applies not only to that carried through the canal, but also on all that is carried by rail, for the water rate, as everyone knows, to all competing points fixes the rail rates. The repeal of the Panama Canal act increased the freight on every carload that the consumer on the Pacific buys on the Atlantic \$60. It increases the freight rate \$60 on every carload that the producer on the Pacific sends to the Atlantic. These facts clearly show that President Wilson was right when he declared that the chief purpose of a free canal for American ships was to compel lower rates on our railroads.

SEATTLE AND VANCOUVER.

The increase in freight rates resulting from the repeal of the law giving American ships free passage through the Panama Canal is not the only injury to Seattle nor the greatest danger from this act. The really great markets that the Panama Canal will open to the people of the Pacific coast are the eastern markets of our own country. The Panama Canal will be of little advantage in securing markets in other parts of the world.

The British Columbia lumberman can charter a cheap foreign vessel to reach the eastern markets of the United States; the Washington lumberman can not. He can use only American vessels, built by American labor, and manned by sailors receiving, by comparison, high wages. Here is a difference so great that the American lumberman can not overcome it. It amounts to approximately \$2 per thousand feet. And let it not be forgotten that every other American industry on the Pacific coast labors under exactly a similar handicap. The great markets of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other Atlantic cities, by the repeal of the Panama Canal act, were largely taken from us and given to British Columbia. Vancouver, and not Seattle, is to become the great commercial city of the Pacific Northwest if American ships are to receive no advantage in the use of the Panama Canal. For this situation the Democratic Party alone is to blame. The repeal of the present Democratic law is the only hope for the future commercial supremacy of Seattle.

Here is the situation that has been brought about by Democratic legislation, and against which the Republican Representatives of the State of Washington have protested in vain: A builder in Spokane buys a thousand tons of structural steel from the eastern coast. If American ships could pass through the canal free, as they could before the Democratic repeal law went upon the statute books, that steel would be brought to Seattle and then sent to Spokane; but now an American ship must pay the same as a foreign ship to pass through the canal. Consequently, that steel will be sent on a cheap foreign ship to Vancouver, British Columbia, and then from Vancouver to Spokane. This can be done without the payment of a cent of duty. Again, the producer of eastern Washington, when he sends his produce to the Atlantic coast, will ship it to Vancouver—not to Seattle—and from there it will go by a cheap foreign ship, with its foreign crews, to its destination. These foreign cheap vessels, under our laws, can not come to Seattle; but the shipper, by going to Vancouver, can get every advantage of this foreign cheap tonnage. The freight rates between Spokane and Vancouver are exactly the same as the rates between Spokane and Seattle, and this applies, of course, to practically all interior points. When the emergency shipping legislation was pending

the Republican Members of the House and Senate from the State of Washington used every endeavor to have this unjust discrimination corrected, but a Democratic majority refused. If such unjust and tyrannical discrimination applied to a city of the South as it applies to Seattle, it would be corrected in less than 90 days.

The wayfaring man can see what is going to be the result of this Democratic legislation. All the trade of the Pacific Northwest that will pass through the Panama Canal, except the very small amount along the water's edge of Puget Sound, will pass through Vancouver. Vancouver will be the place where rail and water traffic will meet. Vancouver and not Seattle will be the great commercial city of the North Pacific. For this situation there is but one remedy, and that is a return of the Republican Party to power. As soon as the Republican Party once more takes control of the Nation it will relieve this situation and redeem the credit and honor of the Nation by immediately reenacting the law that will give every American ship the right to pass through the Panama Canal absolutely free. To this end and to this purpose I expect to strive and fight every day until it is realized as long as I remain a Member of Congress.

The repeal of the Panama Canal provision permitting American ships to pass through the canal without the payment of tolls by the Democratic Party, in spite of their platform pledges, was a fatal blow to Seattle's greatness and prosperity. I can not understand how any American citizen, and especially a citizen of Seattle, can vote for a party that by law deliberately attempts to destroy Seattle in favor of our foreign rival. The people of Seattle do not yet fully understand this situation, but they will as the days go by and as the traffic through the canal increases.

By the repeal of the Panama Canal act the Democratic Party placed a burden upon every industry on the Pacific coast. It increased the cost of living to every family. It favored the railroads as against the people. It favored the foreigner as against the American.

For this great blessing, for this great piece of constructive legislation, for this betrayal of their confidence, for this destruction of their hopes, for this taking from them the benefits of the canal for which they had hoped and for which they had paid and upon the prospects of which they had pledged their credit and expended millions—for thus taking these benefits and giving them to the foreigner without money and without price the people of the Pacific coast are filled with gratitude, and will lift up their voice in psalms of praise for the patriotism and the courage and the integrity and the good faith shown by the Democratic Party.

EMERGENCY SHIPPING LEGISLATION.

The war in Europe caused a great clamor in the Democratic Party, and especially from members of that party in the South, for ships to carry out foreign commerce. Cotton was hit. These southern Members suddenly forgot the fight that they had made for years against an American merchant marine. The cry of subsidy died upon their lips. They demanded immediate relief, and a law intended to help this situation and to get their cotton to market was promptly passed. The people of the Pacific coast pleaded that this law help them also, that provisions be made in this law whereby the products of the Pacific coast could be sent to the Atlantic markets. The lumbermen especially asked for aid. The Pacific coast people pointed out that they were helpless; that the repeal of the Panama Canal act giving free tolls to American ships had given a great advantage to British Columbia. But this plea for relief for the Pacific coast was denied. The South and the East were cared for, and, as usual, the Pacific coast was neglected. Surely the people of the State of Washington should feel grateful to the Democratic Party for the way it was treated in this emergency shipping bill. Under this administration the South has always been carefully cared for, and the Pacific coast is always neglected.

SUSPENSION OF THE NAVIGATION LAWS.

Under the emergency shipping legislation recently passed the President was given the power to suspend the navigation laws with reference to foreign vessels that took the American flag. He had the power of permitting these foreign vessels that took the American flag to be officered by foreigners. The Masters, Mates, and Pilots' Association of the Pacific Coast recently protested against this being done with reference to vessels on the Pacific Ocean. This association pointed out that there were between 600 and 800 American officers on the Pacific that were idle; that they had served their country faithfully; that they had paid for their licenses; and they asked that they be given preference over citizens of other countries, but their protests went unheeded. To-day we have many idle American officers,

while many of our ships are manned by foreigners. For this also the people of Puget Sound should give thanks to this administration.

The Democratic Party is now thoroughly committed to the policy of building up our merchant marine by buying foreign ships built in foreign yards by foreign cheap labor, manned by foreign sailors, and run by foreign officers; the only thing American about this Democratic merchant marine being the flag, and even that may have been made in a foreign land.

DEMOCRATIC PROMISES.

The Democratic Party promised to reduce the cost of living and to bring greater prosperity than we possessed in 1912. It was this promise more than anything else that brought the Democratic Party again into power. Who to-day will contend that they have kept that promise? Who to-day will say that they prefer the conditions that exist now to those in 1912? Who will contend that prices have been reduced? Who will contend that wages have been increased? Who will contend that there is more work now than there was when the Democratic administration went into power? Who will deny that there are more idle men now than then? Where is the family that will say that the burden of living is lighter now than then?

When the Democratic Party boasts that it has done much for the State of Washington I challenge the statement. It has not opened a single mill. It has not lighted a single fire in a furnace. It has not given a single man an additional day's work. It has increased no man's wages. It has not given an additional loaf of bread to any family. It has increased idleness. It has increased poverty. It has thrown thousands out of employment. It has reduced wages. It has increased the cost of living for the family of every toiler. Democratic legislation has been sectional. It has been unjustly favorable to the South and unjustly discriminatory against the Pacific coast.

WAR TAXES.

And now the Democratic Party proposes to place upon the State of Washington, as upon all other parts of the country, a "war" tax in time of peace. It is, indeed, a "war" tax. It is a tax made necessary by the Democratic war upon American industry. It is made necessary by the Democratic Party opening our markets, without price, to the goods of foreign countries. It is a free-trade tax. The war may have hastened it, but it would have come anyway. This was certain. Increased expenditures on the one hand and decreased revenues on the other would have suggested to any but Democratic statesmen that the end would be an empty Treasury. A Democratic administration and an empty Treasury are synonymous. For this additional burden of a direct tax in time of peace the people of my State are expected to regard as an additional blessing and to be duly thankful therefor.

ALASKA.

It is the constant boast of this administration that it has been of great benefit to Alaska. Upon what foundation or facts do these claims rest? During this administration legislation has been passed providing for the construction of a railroad in Alaska that may cost \$35,000,000. That this legislation was of great benefit to Alaska and the State of Washington we all hope and believe. This proposition to construct a railroad in Alaska was begun under President Taft, and the preliminary work was done during his administration. When this legislation passed Congress it was opposed and favored by men in all parties. The vote was strictly nonpartisan. The strongest opposition to this legislation came from the Democratic chairman of the great Committee on the Public Lands. But the administration is entitled to credit, and no fair-minded man desires to diminish it or to take it from them.

But this building of a railroad in Alaska, if it is accomplished, and little so far has been done except on paper, will amount to nothing unless it is supplemented by other legislation. Unless Congress passes more laws that will develop the coal mines and the other resources of Alaska this railroad, when finished, will be only an idle and discreditable streak of rust.

For more than a year and a half this Democratic administration has been in continuous session. With all its promises and its boasts, what has it done for Alaska? No legislation is yet upon our statute books that will open the coal mines in Alaska, and upon the opening of these mines all progress and development of Alaska waits. A few days ago the so-called coal-leasing bill passed the House. It was passed for political purposes and not for the purpose of the benefit of Alaska. It is impractical and was hurried through the House for the effect it would have upon the so-called conservationists in the East at the coming election. This bill was passed to get votes, not to open mines.

More than 500 coal claims in Alaska are awaiting decisions. These claims have been awaiting decisions ever since this administration went into power on the 4th day of March, 1913. All the facts and evidence in most of these cases have been before the department for more than a year and a half. The people of Alaska have been demanding and petitioning that these claims be decided. The claimants have been clamoring for a decision. What is the reason of this delay? If these claims are fraudulent, why does not the department say so and decide for the Government? This certainly would be in the interest of the people. If, on the other hand, the claimants are honestly entitled to their claims, why does not the department say so? What is the matter? There can be but one explanation. The Democratic officials in the Interior Department do not have the courage to do their duty. They are waiting until after the election. The conditions in Alaska, so far as the coal claims are concerned, stand exactly as they did four years ago. There is no justification for such action. While these officials stand and wait, fearing to act, the people of Alaska are forced to pay exorbitant prices for foreign coal, while they dare not touch the unlimited supply that lies at their very doors. And yet this administration proceeds in a loud voice to proclaim that they are special friends of Alaska.

The people of Alaska and the State of Washington pleaded with Congress to give a small appropriation to locate the dangerous rocks and other obstructions to navigation along the Alaskan coast. They presented their petition and filed with it a list showing an appalling loss of life and property. The number of vessels that have recently gone to their doom tell a story that it was thought this Democratic Congress must certainly heed. Personally I wrote a letter to every Member of the House and Senate pointing out the result of these disasters and asking in the name of humanity, the people of Alaska and the Northwest, that a small sum be appropriated for this purpose. This appeal for this appropriation was refused with scant consideration.

In all the countless millions appropriated by this Congress—the most extravagant in the history of the Nation—there was nothing to make more safe navigation between Puget Sound and Alaska.

Again the people of Alaska asked for a small appropriation for hospitals and medical assistance for the natives of that Territory. They pointed out the fearful ravages that disease is making among these people, the necessity of aid to save them from extermination. But the insignificant sum of \$50,000 asked for this purpose was rejected. Certainly the people of Alaska should feel grateful to this Democratic Congress when they look upon this record and when they see the extravagance in all other departments and then remember that they have been denied these small pittance to protect their most vital interests.

BUSINESS AGITATION.

Like all other sections, the State of Washington and Alaska have been greatly injured by the constant agitation and attacks on business since the Democratic Party came into power. The fear and uncertainty caused by proposed legislation for political purposes only has injured the entire Nation. This agitation will continue as long as the Democratic Party remains in power. It must continue, for the foundation of all our industrial disturbance to-day is the Underwood tariff law. The Democratic Party, of course, will never consent that it be changed. Consequently they must continue to agitate and to do something else to try to overcome the evil effect of our present tariff. What this Nation needs to-day above all things else is an adjournment of Congress. What we need is more prosperity and less legislation. Congress will stay in practically continuous session as long as the Democratic Party controls the country. The one hope for prosperity and for business peace is a Republican majority in the next House of Representatives.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD very briefly on the subject of general legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD relating to the legislation of this Congress. Is there objection?

Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I ask for the same privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LEE] asks for the same privilege. Is there objection to these two requests?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. No gentleman desiring to be recognized, the question now is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Good].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 68. PAR. 2. The superintendent of documents shall supply, wrap, mail, and otherwise dispatch all publications subject to valuation distribution upon the written order of the person entitled to the same, who shall furnish addressed frank slips or envelopes therefor; and the superintendent of documents shall charge a price uniform to everyone for publications so supplied sufficient to cover the cost of paper, handling, and printing from plates as determined by the Public Printer: *Provided*, That upon the requisition of the superintendent of documents the Public Printer is hereby authorized to print or reprint from time to time a sufficient number of copies of such publications as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section: *Provided further*, That the superintendent of documents shall promptly furnish each person entitled to a valuation account or document quota under this section with information and the prices of all publications available for such distribution in advance of printing the first edition thereof, if possible, and he shall also render statements from time to time to each person entitled to the same concerning the condition of his valuation account.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 77, line 11, after the word "supplied," strike out the words "sufficient to cover the" and insert "which price shall be the actual."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like, if I can, to know what this provision means, anyhow. What is it that this provision does?

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will permit, I will state that there is another amendment; there are three. One strikes out the word "handling," and another makes it the actual cost of paper and printing. As I stated in my opening remarks to-day, this was contemplated in the bill all the way. That word "handling" there might be construed to mean that there would be a charge for wrapping, and it is the intention of the committee to have these documents supplied at the cost of the actual printing, because the Printing Office has the labor to do the necessary wrapping.

Mr. MANN. I will say to my friend from Indiana that I think it is still left in doubt as to what it means, even with that provision stricken out. Let us see what it says. This is a very important section under this valuation plan. The preceding section provides for the valuation credits. Then this paragraph comes along and says:

The superintendent of documents shall supply, wrap, mail, and otherwise dispatch all publications subject to valuation distribution upon the written order of the person entitled to the same, who shall furnish addressed frank slips or envelopes therefor; and the superintendent of documents shall charge a price uniform to everyone for publications so supplied sufficient to cover the cost of paper, handling, and printing from plates as determined by the Public Printer.

Now, is this "paper, handling, and printing from plates" the cost of printing the editions, or is it the cost in the office of the superintendent of documents? The superintendent of documents plainly has nothing to do with the printing from plates, nor would the superintendent of documents, where he has gone to the expense of handling documents, transfer to the Public Printer the authority to determine the amount. And while that provision, in connection with the preceding one, might lead to the impression—and possibly that was the impression of the author of the bill—that the cost to be charged to a Member was the cost of wrapping and the wrapping paper used, still the language of the bill does not carry out that thought. We both want to get at the same thing—

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; we are both aiming at the same thing. The intention is to perfect this provision and make it right and clear.

Mr. MANN. So that we will know what it means.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. The paragraph as amended will read, beginning in line 9—

And the superintendent of documents shall charge a price uniform to everyone for publications so supplied, which price shall be the actual cost of paper and printing from plates as determined by the Public Printer.

The superintendent of documents will be instructed by the Public Printer as to exactly this cost, and that is what he must charge; no more and no less.

Mr. MANN. Here are two charges, and I want to know which one this refers to. I should like to have the gentleman's statement for future reference in construction. There is one charge for printing the documents, and there is paper and there is handling, and there is presswork in connection with printing from plates. There is another charge, entirely separate from that, after the edition has been printed, when a Member makes a requisition for certain copies of that edition. There is a charge for wrapping and handling in the office of the superin-

tendent of documents. Now, which of these two charges is referred to here?

Mr. BARNHART. I have explained to the gentleman that the amendment offered by the committee will strike out the word "handling." That will eliminate the wrapping feature, and the bill, when it is perfected, will read—

Which price shall be the actual cost of paper and printing from plates as determined by the Public Printer.

It will not include the cost of making the plates, but just the reprint.

Mr. MANN. If the cost is for printing the edition, I do not think the word "handling" ought to come out, because in fixing the price at which these documents are furnished to a Member he should be charged with the cost of the paper that is used in the book, the cost of handling in the Printing Office in connection with the work of printing, and the cost of the presswork. He should be charged with all that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. If it means the cost of handling, then the word "handling" ought to be in. If it means that the Members are to be charged with the cost of wrapping and mailing out the documents, then we ought to strike it out entirely, or else strike out the presswork cost.

Mr. BARNHART. It is understood in printing offices that the cost of paper and the cost of reprinting from plates would imply the handling of the plates and the handling of the paper for that part of the work. It is not merely putting it on the press; it is the work of assembling it and getting it ready for printing and adjusting the press. That is all a part of the printing.

Mr. MANN. That is all a part of the cost of printing?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but the Printing Office keeps those items separately. Now, you undertake to say here what cost shall be included in fixing the cost, and you say "paper." The cost of paper does not include any handling by itself in the Printing Office. There is the cost of the paper and the cost of printing from the plates. Of course plainly that was intended to cut out the cost of composition, but the cost of preparing the plates is plainly intended to be included, and ought to be. Now, if you cut out handling in the Printing Office and charge nothing but the cost of the paper and the presswork itself, and if this means the cost of the edition, why the word "handling" ought to stay in. But if it does not mean that—and there has been a question raised about it—why there is another proposition. I wish the gentleman would say for the benefit of the RECORD and of those who are going to construe this law whether this cost that is to be charged to Members is to be the cost in the office of the superintendent of documents or the cost of printing the edition in the Public Printing Office only.

Mr. BARNHART. The language would clearly set forth that it would be the cost in the office of the Public Printer only, because it specifies the paper and printing. Now, I have explained to the gentleman from Illinois that the present law carries a 10 per cent increase over the cost of paper and printing, to bear certain expenses that it was alleged it cost in getting work ready for delivery after it was done. But in conference with the Public Printer it was found that this varies so widely, and that inasmuch as he has a force used largely for that purpose—

Mr. MANN. I understand that.

Mr. BARNHART. So it was thought best to strike that out entirely and let the general appropriation for the Public Printer take care of the matter of making everything ready for delivery that he prints, whether it is for sale or whether it is allotments to Members of Congress.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but I submitted this matter to several gentlemen, some of them in the House and some of them employees of the House, and among them the very efficient clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing. I will not undertake to say what he said or what the others said, but a number of them stated to me upon reading this that their judgment was that this would cover the cost of wrapping and mailing from the office of the superintendent of documents. I said I thought the bill was intended only to cover the cost of the edition, and I understand that the gentleman from Indiana takes that position, although I have not been able to get him to say so without qualification.

Mr. BARNHART. If I have not made myself clear, I am sorry.

Mr. MANN. Why does not the gentleman say in so many words whether that is his opinion?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly when you remove the word "handling" you remove the possibility of any charge for wrapping.

Mr. MANN. But you do not remove the charge for wrapping paper. I contend that the provision does not include the office of superintendent of documents at all. You can not mix them; it is one or the other.

Mr. BARNHART. So long as it sets forth, with the word "handling" out of it, that it shall cover the cost of printing from plates and paper, I do not see how anyone can construe that language to mean that there should be an additional cost for wrapping.

Mr. MANN. Is it to cover the cost of wrapping paper?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly not. They wrap most all documents printed, whether they are for sale or to be distributed under allotment, and it is not intended to cover wrapping paper at all.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman another question? This says:

The superintendent of documents shall supply, wrap, mail, and otherwise dispatch all publications subject to valuation distribution upon the written order of the person entitled to the same, who shall furnish addressed frank slips or envelopes therefor.

That would apparently say that all the documents subject to valuation distribution—and that will include everything after it goes into effect except those things which Members now have in the folding room—should be distributed by the superintendent of documents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Apparently that language would indicate that all the distribution is to be made by the superintendent of documents. I think we had a sort of understanding in the House the other day, based on several votes which were had, that if the folding room of the House should be retained—and that is purely a matter for the House to determine hereafter—Members might draw out their quota of books under the credit balance and transfer them to the superintendent of the folding room in the House. In other words, if we print an edition of The Horse Book this year, and a Member is entitled under the law and desires to avail himself of the right of taking 500 copies, which he does not wish to distribute at once, only as the demands come in, he may transfer them to the folding room of the House for storage, and so supply the documents as the requests come to him, because there will not be an edition printed every year. I think the language ought to be corrected so as to clearly show that we have that right.

Mr. BARNHART. In line 6, Mr. Chairman, of section 68, paragraph 2, one of the amendments sent to the desk will change the language as follows:

The superintendent of documents shall supply, wrap, mail, or otherwise dispatch all publications subject to mailing.

He may wrap and mail them or dispatch them up here to the Capitol, as he is directed.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman, being in charge of the bill, is of the opinion that if that language is modified in that way and enacted into law, if any Member desires he may order from the superintendent of documents a hundred copies of a certain publication to be sent to his credit in the folding room as long as the House maintains the folding room?

Mr. BARNHART. I have no doubt about it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman says he has no doubt about it, but which way?

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman asked me a question if I believed so and so, and I say I have no doubt about it. It seems to me I could not make it any clearer.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman might have no doubt that I was wrong. It is hard to get the gentleman to state square-toed his position without some qualification.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman will state to me in clear language what he means, I think I can answer him. I can not surmise what the gentleman wants me to say in addition to saying that I have no doubt, under the provisions of this bill and the amendment, that he will be permitted to direct the superintendent of documents to send such volumes as he may desire to the folding room, where he can get them at such times as he desires.

Mr. MANN. That is what I have been trying to get the gentleman to say.

Mr. BARNHART. And it is what I have constantly been saying.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. Does the chairman think that if these books should be placed to the credit of Members in the folding room and a number were left when his term of office expired, they would pass to the credit of his successor?

Mr. BARNHART. They ought to. They would be to the credit of the district; that is the provision of the bill.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. With pleasure.

Mr. FESS. I would like to ask the chairman in reference to the same paragraph. I had understood that this paragraph would probably abolish the folding room. Is there any intention of doing that?

Mr. BARNHART. No.

Mr. FESS. With the paragraph as it stands, amended as you have suggested, we could get our documents from the folding room the same as we do now?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly; if Members choose to do it that way. It would make it more expensive if you have them sent up here to the House folding room. The House folding room was continued for the purpose of having speeches folded and in order to have the advantages and conveniences and efficiency of such a service near at hand for the Congress.

Mr. FESS. My desire was to know whether we would have to go to the superintendent of public documents for a document for ourselves?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I think any order that the gentleman would give to the superintendent of documents might be filled by sending it to the gentleman's office, or he might send it at the gentleman's direction by mail or to the House folding room, but it will be charged to the gentleman when it is given to his order. It will be out of the care and keeping of the superintendent of documents at the Printing Office after it leaves his custody, and it will then be charged to the Member's allotment.

Mr. FESS. If I were sending a document to my district, I would not care so much, but if I wanted it for my own use here I think I could get it much more quickly from the folding room than I could get it from the superintendent of documents.

Mr. BARNHART. That might and it might not be true, because the intention is to use the Printing Office delivery. If the gentleman wanted it sent to his office, it would go directly to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARNHART. I have another amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 77, line 12, after the word "paper," strike out the word "handling."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 77, line 6, after the word "wrap," strike out the words "mail, and" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and mail or."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, page 77, line 5, after section 68, paragraph 2, the following: "All publications for valuation distribution upon orders of the Vice President, Senators, Representatives, Delegates, Resident Commissioners, and officers of the Senate and of the House of Representatives shall be delivered to their respective folding rooms, to be wrapped and credited to the persons entitled to them and held subject to the orders of said persons."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain that a little. This amendment has the effect of sending these documents to our folding rooms. I expect that is the intention of the committee, or I gathered it from the colloquy that has been had. If it is not the intention of the committee to send these

documents to our folding rooms, then it seems to me the amendment ought to go in there in that form.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. One of the purposes of this bill is to effect dispatch of the public service, and economy. The Government has just constructed a post office adjacent to the Government Printing Office, with connecting tubes, and the cost of hauling these documents to the Capitol and letting them lie here and then hauling them back to the post office is the very thing that the Committee on Appropriations has been eliminating from all the departments, because it is an extra cost. If the House sees fit to send its force to the Government Printing Office, that is what it ought to do; but the discontinuance of hauling these documents to the Capitol and storing them here and then going to the expense of hauling them back to the post office is one of the economies of this bill, and I do not see how the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], if he has any concern for economy, which we are seeking to effect, together with efficiency of getting the documents out quickly, can oppose the plan proposed here. If you want to send your documents to the House folding room here, under the changes that have been made, you can have them all sent down here; but a Member would hardly want to do that. If he wants to send his documents by mail, he will send direct to the superintendent of documents and have them sent out from there, and there is no provision in this bill anywhere that that may not be done by the wrapping force that we now have. It is in the hands of the House. It does not take it out of the hands of the House at all.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, if it is in the hands of the House now, and it is not designed to take it out of the hands of the House, and there is nothing in this except the question of where the documents shall be hauled to or from, what is the objection to the amendment? Whether the folding room is located in some convenient quarter adjacent to the Government Printing Office or located in this Capitol Building is immaterial, but the question that is material is whether it remains under the control and jurisdiction of the Members of this House; and if the chairman means what he says about that, that it is the intention that it shall remain under the control and jurisdiction of the Members of this House, then he and I have no dispute as to where this wrapping shall be done. Of course I recognize the general policy adopted by the committee, to prevent unnecessary hauling of documents back and forth across town. I recognize it is utterly immaterial for the purposes of this bill or any other whether that folding room be adjacent to the Public Printing Office or in this building. In fact, I think it ought to be adjacent to the Public Printing Office, but I think the vital point is whether it remains under the control of the membership of this House. There is nothing in my amendment that militates against the economy proposition of having the document room adjacent to where the documents are printed, and I hope the chairman will accept the amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the committee could not accept an amendment of that kind for the reason that it is estimated by the Public Printer that the transportation of documents back and forth, and so forth, as now done, costs \$20,000 a year. If the gentleman from Missouri wants to insist that we should pay \$20,000 a year to haul documents from the post office up here in order to handle them here and then send them back to the post office, then it would appear to me that he is advocating a proposition that is far from economic, and I trust that he will not insist upon his amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. I trust the gentleman will not mistake the issue that is between us. The gentleman referred to that awhile ago about the Government hauling documents over here. There is no such issue involved in this amendment. There is no \$20,000 involved. Then, what further objection has the gentleman to it?

Mr. BARNHART. The objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri is that it provides that all documents shall be brought to the folding room here at the Capitol and wrapped and then carried back to the post office.

Mr. BORLAND. No; I think the gentleman is mistaken about that. It provides that they shall go to our folding room and remain under the control of the Members of this House, and it does not provide that they shall be brought to this Capitol.

Mr. BARNHART. Then, what—

Mr. BORLAND. It provides exactly what the chairman said was provided by this bill.

Mr. BARNHART. It will necessitate an extra system of bookkeeping.

Mr. BORLAND. It does provide a system of bookkeeping.

Mr. BARNHART. I said an extra system, not a system.

Mr. BORLAND. It provides the present system of book-keeping and has no other purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 3 of the Borland amendment, after the word "shall," insert "upon the individual order of the person entitled thereto."

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that ought to be acceptable to both gentlemen. That would permit any Member to order any documents to his credit.

Mr. BARNHART. I want to ask the gentleman's pardon to have the amendment reread; I was engaged at the moment.

Mr. BORLAND. I would like to hear it also, as I was engaged with the chairman.

Mr. MANN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri would require all documents coming to any Member of Congress to be sent to the folding rooms of the House and the Senate. The amendment which I have offered would leave to the individual Member to determine what documents he will have sent to his respective folding room.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee will readily accept that; that is the very point aimed at.

Mr. MANN. That will leave to the Member the authority to have documents sent to the folding room, which I suppose will be exercised in some cases. In many cases clearly it would be economical and equally efficient to have documents mailed from the office of the superintendent of documents, and it would leave to the Member the control of the matter.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. As I understand the purport of the gentleman's amendment, they would be folded at the Government Printing Office and then brought over on the individual order of any Member.

Mr. MANN. I do not think it would be necessary that they should be folded. I understood from the statement made a while ago that a Member might order the documents sent to him before they had been folded, to his room or otherwise; that is, before they had been wrapped. It would not make any difference where it is done.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to say, as far as I am personally concerned, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois would not change the situation to me. It has been my universal custom to have all documents sent to my own office, and I inspect and sort out everything that is sent there, so that I am sure what I send out to my constituents is something important to the particular men to whom I am sending them. It is a vast amount of work which I do in my own office, and I would not object to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, but I think we ought to have somewhere provided in this bill this system of bookkeeping by which a Member has, under control of the House, a knowledge of what he has to his own credit. I understand that is preserved in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois, and I am perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. BARNHART. The Government Printing Office is under the control of the Congress.

Mr. MANN. No; it is controlled by a gentleman named by the President.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes and no; but Congress has legislative control.

Mr. MANN. I think this would protect everybody's rights.

Mr. BARNHART. I appreciate that fact, but I would like to inquire of the gentleman just where this amendment comes.

Mr. MANN. After the word "shall," insert "upon the individual order of the person entitled thereto."

Mr. BARNHART. That makes it plain, so that nobody could misunderstand it.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. BARNHART. That would complicate the matter to adopt both amendments.

Mr. MANN. No; my amendment is an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri as amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 68. PAR. 4. Documents specifically ordered by Congress for congressional valuation distribution and the following publications shall be printed and subject to distribution by the superintendent of documents under the provisions of this section: *Provided*, That the superintendent of documents shall supply, on the request of the Vice President, or any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner, not to exceed two copies each of any publication of the Government not provided for by this section which he may have available in stock and charge the same against their respective valuation accounts; and if the publications so furnished were printed for sale by the superintendent of documents, the Public Printer shall credit the amount charged therefor to the reprint account of said superintendent by transferring a like sum from the allotment for printing and binding for Congress: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be construed to include the speeches of any Senator, Representative, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner in whatever form printed.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment by the committee making a verbal correction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, line 23, after the word "against," strike out the word "their" and insert the word "his."

Mr. MADDEN. I would like the gentleman to explain how that will make it read.

Mr. BARNHART. "Which he may have available in stock and charge the same against his," so as to simply agree with the antecedent "he" and make it good language.

Mr. MANN. Does not the gentleman want to change the word "accounts" to "account"? I think that would be proper. The object the gentleman desires is not accomplished unless he changes the word "accounts" to the word "account."

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I think that is right and that that should also be in the singular, but let us have a vote on this and then I shall move to strike out the letter "s" in the word "accounts."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I move that, in line 24, the letter "s" in the word "accounts" be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, line 24, strike out the letter "s" from the word "accounts."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman also wants to strike out the word "respective."

Mr. BARNHART. That refers, however, to the Senators, Representatives, Vice Presidents, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners.

Mr. MANN. You would not say "respective account." "Respective" refers to plural.

Mr. BARNHART. I think, Mr. Chairman, the word "respective" ought to go out, and I move that, in line 4, it be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, line 24, strike out the word "respective."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

(1) Addresses and messages of the President to Congress: *Provided*, That the annual message of the President shall be printed in pamphlet form immediately upon its receipt by Congress.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to make an inquiry. We do not have to pay for the President's messages which are laid on our desks, do we?

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman; there is a provision that the usual number will be printed, and this is only for a reprint that goes to the valuation plan. In addition to that, each Member may have two copies of any document. That is the general provision.

Mr. MANN. This section covers the congressional distribution, as I understand?

Mr. BARNHART. As the gentleman well knows, there is now an abridgment of the allotment of messages.

Mr. MANN. I am not talking about the abridgment; I am talking about the messages which the President comes here and reads to us or sends to us.

Mr. BARNHART. This does not change the present plan in that respect as to the annual messages that come here from time to time. It does not change the law in printing the usual number that is now printed. This will make it possible, if you want more than that, to order from allotment. If there should

be a reprint ordered by the House and it were sent to the folding room for distribution, it would then give you the privilege of taking under your valuation plan any number of such messages as you would choose to send out in addition to what you were given under the usual number printed for the House.

Mr. MANN. Now, just as a matter of practice, it is usual when the President's annual message is presented to Congress to have it printed in advance, have copies of it on the floor and distributed to Members at the time the message is delivered to the House. I do not see how it can be done under this. Maybe it can.

Mr. BARNHART. Well, Mr. Chairman, these copies that come in advance, of course, are White House copies. They are the President's publication. He has a printing allotment, too, and, in addition, when the usual number is asked you have them just the same as you have now, and, furthermore, if anyone should want a larger number than has already been printed, and a resolution should be passed to that effect, they would be sent to the folding room, just as they would be now, and they would be charged against your allotment.

Mr. MANN. I had supposed they were copies that came from the document room.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield? Does this paragraph refer to the compilation of addresses and messages of the President which we receive each session?

Mr. BARNHART. It does not.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(2) Congressional Directory: *Provided*, That there shall be prepared, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, not to exceed two editions of the Congressional Directory during each session of Congress. The first edition shall be distributed to the Vice President, Senators, Representatives, Delegates, Resident Commissioners, the principal officials of Congress, and the heads of the executive departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government on the first day of the session, and shall be ready for distribution to others within one week thereafter. The number and disposition of such directories shall be under the control of the Joint Committee on Printing, except as otherwise provided in this section. Official correspondence concerning the directory may be had in penalty envelopes, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing. The compiler of the Congressional Directory shall be appointed by the Joint Committee on Printing and shall receive a compensation of \$1,600 per annum.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 80, line 4, after the word "receive," strike out the words "a compensation of \$1,600 per annum" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$1,600 for compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory for each regular session of Congress, one half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard upon the amendment. This amendment is an addition to the provision here?

Mr. BARNHART. The amendment, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, is really the readoption of the present law in the bill. And, in brief, I might say there were two purposes of it, one is that it is in harmony with what—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment by striking out "\$1,600" and inserting "\$1,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the amendment by striking out "\$1,600" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I should have preferred to have offered another amendment first. A couple of years ago, I think it was, we had a discussion in the House here over payment to the person who got up the Congressional Directory, and the Democratic side of the House threw several cat fits. It was asserted we were paying at that time, and I think we were, \$1,000 or \$1,200 or \$1,400 to somebody whose duty it was to get up the directory, and that that person was paying \$300 or \$400 to have somebody else do the work, and that the difference was a rake-off. And I expect it was true. My recollection is that a former newspaper correspondent, who has since passed away, was the person charged with the duty of preparing the material and supervising the work of getting up the Congressional Directory; that he had transferred the work

to some one else whom they said at the time had done the work from time immemorial, and the person who did the work was receiving \$300 or \$400 or \$500 a year, or something like that. Maybe I have the figures too small or maybe too great. Anyway, it was far below the price paid.

I think the price paid originally was less than \$1,600. Now, that contemplated getting out five editions of the directory for each Congress at least. This bill contemplates doing away with one edition of the directory—and I think it is a mistake—but at the same time it contemplates keeping up the price. The fact is that the Congressional Directory in the main has grown to be a laughable farce. Whoever gets it up does not understand his business. It used to give information about Members of Congress. It does not give any now, unless some comparatively new Member of Congress falls for the request and proceeds to furnish something which he supposes will make people believe it came from some other source, and not from himself, and when he reads in the directory how valuable a man he has been, he blushes and says, "I will never do it again."

Why, the directory used to give the vote for Members of Congress. It does not do it any more. There is hardly a southern Member of Congress that inserts the vote that he gets, and many of the northern Members do not do it any more. In the old days the compiler of the Congressional Directory obtained this information, if it was not furnished to him by the Member of Congress; but he does not do it now. Much of the material that is in the Congressional Directory is not down to date.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Would the gentleman from Illinois admit that the compiler of the Congressional Directory should add to or take from any copy that has been prepared by Members for it? Does the gentleman think that ought to be done?

Mr. MANN. I think they ought to furnish the vote. If it is done in one case, it ought to be done in every case.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. I recall clearly when I first came to Congress that I inserted the vote that I had received. The first time, as I recall, I had 290 plurality, the next time 420 plurality, the next time 1,200, and the next time nearly 12,000. I was too modest to use it.

Mr. MANN. The next time the gentleman will leave it out, and for another reason. [Laughter.] The first time I had it in the directory I had 29,000 majority.

Mr. BARNHART. And you put it in?

Mr. MANN. No; I took it out. I thought people would think it too large, and would urge the making of another district. My first biography in the directory was very short. It is now even shorter. It does not amount to a row of pins. You propose to fix it so that it will not amount to anything. At the long session you propose to fix it so that there will be only two editions of the Congressional Directory. At the long session, of course, the committees are appointed, and the first edition will be printed before the committees are appointed. The second edition—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. The second edition ought to be printed immediately after the committees are appointed, and that has been the practice in the past. The first edition is ready on meeting day, at the beginning of December. The second edition has always been furnished at the beginning of January. Now, you propose to eliminate that, or else have no other edition of the directory for a year, and pay the compiler, who does but little work—and he does not do what little he does do correctly—an exorbitant salary. I do not know who does this work now, but I know that \$500 would be good pay for the editorial work of compiling the directory. So I have offered to make the pay \$1,000, and thus pay him double.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to see the gentleman from Illinois assume an air of economy at this late date. In the Fifty-eighth Congress, a Republican Congress—and this is not any reflection on it—they decided that a competent man, a man who is capable of editing, preparing, proof reading, and, in fact, exercising a general supervision over publications of the Congressional Directory, ought to be paid \$1,000.

Nobody has objected to that up to the present time. And I want to say, in defense of the present compiler of the Congressional Directory, that he does give his time all to the preparation of the Congressional Directory. He does more than act as a figurehead. He is not a newspaper man. He is the compiler of the Congressional Directory; and I believe the House can trust the Joint Committee on Printing to see to it that the compiler of the Congressional Directory will attend to his duties.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I would like to finish this statement, then I will yield.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is no fault of the compiler of the Congressional Directory if a Member of Congress furnishes him with a biography that is ridiculous. But, as I stated to the gentleman from Illinois, I doubt seriously if any Member of this House, after he furnishes the copy for his biography, would like to delegate to the compiler of the directory the privilege of adding to or taking from that biography as he saw fit. A partisan compiler in that case might make the Republicans look ridiculous or the Democrats look righteous and the Progressives look like nothing. [Laughter.] There is a strong probability that something of that kind might be done.

So far as the compensation is concerned, Mr. Chairman, heretofore, when there was an extra edition of the directory, the Republican Congress always paid the compiler of the Directory \$800 for that extra edition. I think it was too much; and in the past few years it has not been done. The compiler now gets \$1,600 for as many editions as the Joint Committee on Printing authorizes, and the purpose of the committee is not to take anything from it, but to try to make it better. For the information of the gentleman from Illinois, I hold in my hand a petition that has just been submitted to the joint committee to make the Congressional Directory still better by inserting the photograph of every Member of the House and Senate, and the petition sets forth with considerable argument the idea that it would be a great educator. And instead of the Congressional Directory being ridiculous, as the gentleman from Illinois alleges, I find it to be in the greatest demand of any Government document that I have to give out. Ministers and teachers and readers generally like it, and there is more demand on me for it than I have copies to supply; and I think that is true with other Members of the House.

Now, of course the reduction of the salary might possibly make the Congressional Directory better. It might eliminate some of these objections that the gentleman from Illinois sees. But I hardly see how that could be. The bill as it is arranged provides for large economies. It provides sufficient salaries, and yet eliminates every unnecessary expense that the committee could find. The committee believed that a man competent to edit and prepare as important a book as the Congressional Directory should be worth \$1,600 a year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I had always been under the impression that this \$1,600 salary was more or less of a perquisite for some attaché to the Committee on Printing. The gentleman stated that the man who performs this work of compilation gives his exclusive time to its preparation. Am I correct?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes. He has an office in the Maltby Building, and has had it there for several years.

Mr. STAFFORD. That man, then, does nothing else than attend to the compiling of the Congressional Directory?

Mr. BARNHART. That is his exclusive business.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] said that my ideas of economy were belated. They began before the gentleman was in public life, and they have always been adhered to. A few Congresses ago, when some of the Democratic Members endeavored to cut down the pay of the compiler of the Congressional Directory, I sympathized and worked with them. It is a wonder that the gentleman will not do now the same thing that he was then trying to do. I have maintained a consistent position. I was in favor all the time of reducing the excessive pay of a nearly useless official. But the gentleman says that we paid the compiler \$1,600 when the Republicans had control, and therefore the Democrats should pay him \$1,600 now. Well, in this bill they have cut off one edition out of three of the Congressional Directory for the long session, but although they have removed all of this onerous work from this overworked official they have not proposed any decrease in the pay of the official. Now, as a matter of fact, outside of the biographies most of the Congressional Directory is the same all the time. All that it is necessary to do is to change a few names and addresses, and they do not do that correctly. Frequently, being forced to

examine the Congressional Directory for information, I find grievous errors in it, although the error I have in mind just now did not occur in the Congressional Directory, and although I do not know whether the compiler of that directory is the one who got up the Biographical Directory, or history of Members of Congress, the record of all Members of Congress. I had occasion to consult that yesterday. There is an old edition and a new edition. There used to be a Member of the House from my State by the name of Herman W. Snow. He was celebrated in his day because he had beaten Uncle Joe. Afterwards he was Sergeant at Arms of the House. We have just been copying from one of his circular letters about reduction in pay, much to the discomfort of the Members of the House. The old directory gave him as living in Illinois. It did not say, I believe, that he was elected from Illinois. They have recently revised that history. I think the same man did it, although I am not sure; but in the new and revised edition they elected Mr. Snow a Member of Congress from Georgia. Is not that a valuable compilation to have? It is just about as valuable as most of the information in the directory.

Mr. BARNHART. The difficulty about the gentleman's statement is that the compiler of the directory did not have anything to do with that. It was gotten out by the printing clerk of the Senate, who was employed to do an entirely different work, and he had no responsibility on him except to get out that publication and get the money for it.

Mr. MANN. I have never been able to find out before who did get it out.

Mr. BARNHART. He was the man who got it out.

Mr. MANN. But I suspect that the compiler of the directory is the man who really got it out—perhaps not the present compiler.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman from Illinois think he is reflecting on many sources of curious and valuable information when he criticizes the directory as he does? Think of the advantages to be obtained from the biographical sketches in the directory.

Mr. MANN. I know the gentleman is not referring to his own biographical sketch or mine. I believe the shortest one that was in the directory was the biographical sketch of a Member who has left us for reasons which appealed to several Members.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that if the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois should prevail, it must necessarily imply that we shall find some gentleman in Washington, D. C., who will take this position and do this work. No man would come here any distance at all from his home for such a salary as that. We have some rights of patronage for our home districts. You have those rights on your side when you are in control and we have them when we are in control. According to this amendment it would be necessary to pick up somebody in Washington who would be willing to take that work part of the year, instead of having a man upon whom the responsibility rests all the time, because we all realize that no man can afford to come here and work and live in Washington in these days for a thousand dollars a year. The gentleman from Illinois says the committee is not trying to economize, but I say he is mistaken. The committee doubted the propriety of issuing an extra edition of the Congressional Directory and paying \$800 to the compiler for each edition. Instead of that it limited it to three editions and paid him the same that he is now receiving. I trust the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois will not prevail.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do I understand that the amendment offered by the gentleman substitutes, instead of an annual salary, a compensation based upon the number of editions of the Congressional Directory?

Mr. BARNHART. Not that. It simply pays him for the work.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the amendment?

Mr. BARNHART. One of the purposes of the amendment is that it would eliminate the possibility, under the language as it stands now, of the Joint Committee on Printing bringing some man here and having him do the work, and then discharging him and putting some political henchman in the place to finish up the year. Under the present language that might be done if the Joint Committee on Printing saw fit to do so. Stranger things have happened. This simply eliminates that possibility. It employs a man to do the work for \$1,600 a year, and yet he can not be discharged at the end of a month. Of course he could be discharged for inefficiency or failure to perform his duties, but it would not enable the committee to discharge a man after

he had performed the work and then appoint some one else to draw the balance of the annual salary.

Mr. STAFFORD. May we have the proposed amendment read again?

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BARNHART:
Page 80, line 4, after the word "receive," strike out the words "a compensation of \$1,600 per annum" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$1,600 for compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory for each regular session of Congress, one half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives."

Amendment to the amendment, offered by Mr. MANN:

Strike out the figures "\$1,600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000."

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman one question?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I take it that the gentleman's proposition is to include all the compensation that the compiler is to receive.

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. The amendment of the gentleman from Indiana says:

For compiling, preparing, and indexing the Congressional Directory for each regular session of Congress.

Mr. BARNHART. He is to have \$1,600 for compiling the directory for each session.

Mr. MANN. It says "each regular session of Congress." How much is he to get when we have a special session?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is it the gentleman's idea that it will come to \$4,800 when we have three sessions?

Mr. BARNHART. What is the proposition of the gentleman?

Mr. MANN. We had a special session of Congress last year, and I think we had a Congressional Directory.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Of course I am not in favor of paying \$1,600 for each session of Congress, and I take it the gentleman is not.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no.

Mr. MANN. It says \$1,600 for each regular session. I think it reads "for compiling the directory for each session of Congress."

Mr. BARNHART. "For compiling and indexing the directory for each regular session of Congress."

Mr. MANN. How much will be paid for a special session?

Mr. BARNHART. It would probably have to be specifically provided for, if a directory was ordered. That would be in the hands of the House, if they deemed it necessary to order it. Under this bill he would not be permitted to go ahead and issue an edition without the order of the House.

Mr. MANN. The bill proposes to pay \$1,600 per annum, and you propose to pay \$1,600 for two regular sessions of Congress. It is sure that when there is a special session there will be a directory ordered and printed, as there ought to be.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would not the same construction be placed on this language, "each regular session," as is now placed on it with reference to the provision giving Members mileage?

Mr. MANN. That is the construction that is placed upon it.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been construed that the language "each regular session" includes a special session.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. BARKLEY. The law with reference to mileage reads "each regular session."

Mr. MANN. The law does not provide mileage for a special session.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then what authority is there for appropriating mileage at a special session?

Mr. MANN. Congress has the power to appropriate money to build machines in the moon, and it may do so some time. When we have a special session it diverts the appropriation made for the regular session to pay the mileage for the special session. They have done that in repeated instances.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thought that a ruling had been made by the Treasury Department that the language "regular session" applied also to special sessions.

Mr. MANN. Not at all; that is not the case. Quite the contrary.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in order to remove any doubt in the minds of gentlemen, this proposes to pay a compensation of \$1,600 a year. Is not that right?

Mr. BARNHART. It is.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Then why not say that that shall be the compensation per annum; that it shall be the duty of the officer to compile an index and directory for each session of Congress, regular or special, as the case may be, at a compensation of \$1,600 per annum. Would not that make it clear?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; and yet if the gentleman was present when I made my first statement he will see the difficulty. This is the law as it stands now, and it is perfectly satisfactory; but the joint committee, as I have said, saw that there had been \$800 extra compensation for a number of years, and they want to eliminate that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says that it is the law now. Does he wish to make that broad statement in view of the fact that in the proposed amendment he adds "each regular session of Congress"?

Mr. BARNHART. That is what we sought to do to prevent the possibility of misunderstanding along the very lines that I have been talking. The language of this has been submitted to the comptroller and he approved it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I listened to the gentleman when he gave the reasons for changing the language from the annual to the present method. I think it would add to the clearness to adhere to the language in the bill rather than substitute the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BARNHART. This was offered at the suggestion of the comptroller and the committee accepted it. It was suggested by authorities higher up that it be changed so as to be beyond question whether an additional sum might be allowed or demanded by the joint committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not see where you could demand an additional salary if you adhere to the language as it is in the bill.

Mr. BARNHART. That does not eliminate the difficulty and the possibility of some committee at some time asking some man to do all the work during the fall and winter when directories are compiled and then discharging him and putting some political henchman on for the balance of the year with nothing to do. That was the purpose of the change in language, and nothing else.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the gentleman knows that that would only be a very rare contingency.

Mr. BARNHART. The committee thought it would strengthen the bill, and so prepared the amendment, and I have offered it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MANN. I ask for a division to see whether there are any economists in the House.

The committee divided; and there were—yeas 14, yeas 15.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

(4) Digest and Manual of the House of Representatives: *Provided*, That the House of Representatives shall print and bind as many copies as it may desire, even though the cost thereof may exceed \$500.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making a brief inquiry. What is the purpose of carrying in both paragraphs the limitation as to the limit of cost? I know it is existing law, but I can not see the purpose of carrying it into permanent law.

Mr. BARNHART. The law limits a House resolution to \$500.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is a provision for the Senate Manual and the House Manual.

Mr. BARNHART. If a simple resolution of the House provided a document that the House wanted and needed, it might authorize the publication of more than \$500 worth without asking the Senate to concur. It is a matter wholly within the discretion of the House, and is the present law and has worked very well.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(10) Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury: *Provided*, That when the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency upon the national banks and banks under State and Territorial laws is completed or while it is in process of completion, if thereby the business may be sooner dispatched, the work of printing shall be commenced under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the whole shall be printed and ready for delivery on or before the 1st day of December next after the close of the year to which the report relates: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to print not to exceed 10,000 copies for distribution by the Treasury Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire of the chairman whether that

authorization to the Secretary of the Treasury to print 10,000 additional copies is existing law?

Mr. BARNHART. It is an increase of 3,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that the reason for the increase is to provide additional copies for the increasing number of banks.

Mr. BARNHART. That is the purpose of it.

The Clerk read as follows:

(13) Publications of the Public Health Service, Department of the Treasury: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to print not to exceed 4,000 copies of the Annual Report of the Public Health Service for distribution by the Treasury Department: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to print not to exceed 5,000 copies in any one fiscal year of each of the Bulletins of the Hygienic Laboratory, not exceeding 10 in number in any one fiscal year, and of the Yellow Fever Institute of the Public Health Service of the United States, not exceeding five in number in any one fiscal year: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to print other publications of the Public Health Service and extracts therefrom in such numbers as he may deem for the best interest of the Government.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out "4,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 82, line 7, strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ten."

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, the Treasury Department is now permitted to print 4,000 copies of the annual report of the Public Health Service each year. Those 4,000 copies do not nearly supply the demand for this publication. It is of a good deal of interest. It is on the subject of public health, and it is gotten out annually, and it seems to me the number that is printed ought to be increased and that we ought to print more of these reports. I know that since I have been a Member of the House I have had difficulty in securing a sufficient number of these reports to supply those who want to read them to know what has been done by the Public Health Service in the past year, and I think it is of importance that we should have more of these reports printed for distribution among the people. It has been only a short time, a year or two, since the scope of the Public Health Service was enlarged so that they are now able to print certain bulletins that are distributed to Members, which are received possibly once a week, and which can be sent out not only to the physicians but to the public generally. I think that it is of a good deal of importance in the matter of hygiene and health that we should have these publications distributed among the people. I think we could do no better work, so far as this bill is concerned, than to increase the number of the publications gotten out by the Public Health Service.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not the Secretary of the Treasury have that authority under the proviso in the last paragraph, which gives him unlimited discretion to print other publications of the public service in such numbers as he may deem necessary for the best interest of the Government?

Mr. FOSTER. I think not. This refers to such bulletins as he may be allowed a certain allotment of money to print, but it has been the law, so far as I understand it, that the Secretary can permit the Director of the Public Health Service to print 4,000 copies of the annual report, and that he is limited and has always been limited to that number. Is not that correct?

Mr. BARNHART. That is the present law.

Mr. FOSTER. This does not increase it.

Mr. BARNHART. No. I think I can explain the matter satisfactorily to the gentleman from Illinois. So far as the committee is concerned, and so far as I as chairman of that committee am concerned, I want to indorse everything that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has said. I have always been in favor of furnishing to the people of my district everything possible that may contribute to their health and general comfort, and I believe that as a matter of education we could not go too far in distributing bulletins and publications to rising generations that will equip them or afford them with the largest means of health and prosperity possible; but in this instance, while the intention of the gentleman is good, I want to call his attention to the fact that this merely provides that the same amount of publications shall be published as now, and without any resolution in the Congress reprints may be furnished by the superintendent of documents; also if the gentleman from Illinois or myself—and I shall avail myself of the privilege very largely—chooses to take such bulletins from the superintendent of documents, rather than the geological surveys and the vast number of publications which

we can not use, then we can get all we want and have them charged to our allotments. We submitted this to the Health Service and to the Treasury, and there was no objection. In fact, there was approval of the plan, and I trust that the gentleman will see the economy and efficiency of permitting it to stand as it is, although the few additional copies, it is true, would be inconsequential in cost.

Mr. FOSTER. I suggest that it would not cost a great deal more to print this additional number and have the whole report together. I hope the gentleman will not oppose the amendment, because I think it is important enough to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

(17) Annual report to Congress of the Commissioner of Patents, without list of patents and patentees, Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That section 494 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is hereby repealed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire what is the purpose of the committee in recommending the repeal of section 494 of the Revised Statutes? I notice that that section requires the Commissioner of Patents to make an annual report, giving a detailed statement of all moneys received for patents and copies of patents and the like—an account of his administration of that bureau. This provision repeals that section.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, he is under obligations to make a fiscal report to the Congress just the same as now. The purpose of this is to get rid of this voluminous document, that is of practically no use to anyone. It is a long list of patents and publications that no living man ever takes the time, probably, to go through. It has been published year after year, and it accumulates in large numbers. The Commissioner of Patents has asked that this action be taken; and I think the gentleman, under those conditions, will appreciate the importance of the amendment. The report is printed in another form—more condensed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course I can understand how it would be of no interest to Members of Congress, but I thought that perhaps it might be of some interest to practitioners before the Patent Office. The gentleman is quite certain that he will continue to make his account of moneys received in regular form?

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, yes; he would have to do that to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there are a dozen men here, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-one gentlemen are present—not a quorum—and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Anthony	Edmonds	Hughes, W. Va.	Moore
Austin	Elder	Humphreys, Miss.	Morgan, La.
Baker	Faison	Johnson, Utah	Morin
Barchfield	Fields	Jones	Mott
Bartlett	Finley	Kahn	Murdock
Bell, Cal.	Francis	Kelster	Murray, Mass.
Bell, Ga.	Frear	Kent	Neeley, Kans.
Borland	French	Kiess, Pa.	Oldfield
Broussard	Gardner	Kindel	O'Shaunessy
Brown, N. Y.	George	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Paige, Mass.
Brown, W. Va.	Gerry	Kinkaid, N. J.	Palmer
Browning	Gillett	Kitchin	Parker
Brumbaugh	Godwin, N. C.	Knowland, J. R.	Payne
Bryan	Goldfogle	Konop	Peterson
Burke, Pa.	Gorman	Korbly	Porter
Burke, Wis.	Goulden	Lafferty	Pou
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Ill.	Langley	Powers
Calder	Graham, Pa.	Lazaro	Reed
Callaway	Greene, Mass.	Lee, Ga.	Riordan
Cantor	Gregg	L'Engle	Sabath
Cantrill	Griest	Lever	Scully
Carlin	Guernsey	Levy	Seldomridge
Carr	Hamill	Lewis, Md.	Sells
Carter	Hamilton, N. Y.	Lewis, Pa.	Sherley
Clancy	Hammond	Lindbergh	Slemp
Connolly, Iowa	Hardwick	Lindquist	Small
Corry	Harris	Lloyd	Stedman
Copley	Hart	Loft	Stevens, Minn.
Covington	Haugen	McClellan	Stevens, N. H.
Cramton	Hay	McGuire, Okla.	Stringer
Diffenderfer	Hayes	McKenzie	Summers
Dooling	Heflin	Mahan	Taylor, Colo.
Doughton	Hensley	Mann	Thompson, Okla.
Driscoll	Hinebaugh	Martin	Townsend
Druker	Hobson	Merritt	Treadway
Dunn	Howard	Metz	Tuttle
Eagan	Howell	Mondell	Vare
Eagle	Hoxworth	Montague	Vollmer

Walker
Wallin
Walsh
Walters

Watkins
Weaver
Webb
Whaley

Whitacre
Williams
Willis
Wilson, N. Y.

Winslow
Woodruff
Woods

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15902, and finding itself without a quorum, under the rule he caused the roll to be called; whereupon 264 Members responded to their names—a quorum—and he reported the list of absentees to be entered upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting. The Clerk read as follows:

(18) United States maps, Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That United States maps prepared in the General Land Office may be mounted with rollers ready for use for congressional valuation distribution.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, on last Monday, when the Philippine bill was under discussion, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] declined to be interrupted by his colleague, Mr. Gordon—

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. BARNHART. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Florida if his remarks pertain to the bill in hand?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, just let me have five minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. Do not spring something on us that will take up a lot of time, otherwise I shall have to ask for the regular order.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in declining the gentleman used this language:

I can not allow anybody to interrupt me who has absolutely no regard for what he says.

In the same column of the RECORD in discussing what has been called the "grandfather clause"—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to have it understood, if the gentleman is going to speak extensively—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Five minutes is all I desire.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). On what the gentleman from Ohio said I shall insist that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] shall have an equal amount of time in which to reply.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been under consideration for a long time, and I am anxious to get through with it. The very fact is that if the gentleman from Florida is allowed to speak on a topic other than that under consideration, other Members will be entitled to the same privilege, and I trust the gentleman will not insist upon it at this time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will yield to me—

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit a request for unanimous consent to allow the Member from Florida to have five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, in the same column of the RECORD the gentleman used this language in discussing the "grandfather clause," as it has come to be known with relation to certain States:

Take the State of Florida, with 204,000 men of voting age; nearly half of them are of the black race. That means that out of the 204,000, over 102,000 have the right to participate in the government so far as the rights of electors are concerned. But when you take the actual vote as cast in an actual election, there is not as large a vote in the whole State by at least one-half as will be cast in my district in November.

I want to submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is a very clear intimation in the gentleman's remarks that some sort of "grandfather clause" obtains in the Florida constitution. I am not here to apologize for "grandfather clauses," because I believe any act is justifiable when it has for its object the rule of the intelligent and virtuous of any community; but I am here to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is absolutely no disfranchisement of anybody in the laws of the State of Florida. We have what is known as a poll-tax prerequisite. The sum of \$1 a year is to be paid by every man, of whatever color he may be, as a poll tax, which goes into a school fund; and if at the election

it appears that for the two years immediately preceding such election his poll taxes have not been paid he can not vote—

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In just a moment. Then, Mr. Chairman, we have the Australian ballot in its purity and in its simplicity. We have no symbols by which an ignorant person can make a mark in a circle and thus vote an entire ticket.

The names of the candidates, without regard to party, are arranged alphabetically, without a symbol of any character, and a man must know how to read in order to vote for candidates of his choice.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am glad to yield, of course.

Mr. FESS. As to the reference to the poll tax, before one votes he must satisfy the election officials that he has paid his poll tax, and that satisfaction is by the receipt?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. FESS. That is one method that I think you ought to make plain here. That likely would be difficult to do.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Why would it be difficult to do?

Mr. FESS. Because usually, or frequently, people do not carry receipts around with them.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. You do not have to produce your receipt unless your name does not appear on the list as having paid the tax. All the names of those who have paid appear; but if by accident or by mistake some name does not appear, then the voter is challenged, and he produces his receipt. And I want to say that any man in any State who is not willing to pay \$1 a year for the school fund of his State ought not to be allowed to vote, whether he is black or white. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, then, Mr. Chairman, one thing further—

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Just a moment. The gentleman stated we would not poll half the vote in the whole State of Florida that he would poll in his district. In the last election there were thirty-six thousand and some hundred votes polled in the gentleman's district. In the general election of 1912 in the State of Florida there were over 44,000 votes polled for Members of Congress; but in the primary, which really determines it, there were in the neighborhood of 65,000 votes polled in the State of Florida. The gentleman charges his colleague with not having due regard for veracity, and right on the heel of it shows such a reckless disregard for the truth as to make these two statements, which he could have found out were untrue by only a few moments of investigation. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And, again, the population of Florida of men over voting age is 214,195. Of whites there are 124,311, and of negroes only 89,659, a clear majority of white voters of over 35,000 men. In addition, we have 225 of Chinese and other races.

We do not have to do anything unfair or unjust to defeat this black horde and to prevent their controlling our State affairs. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I ask it for him, too, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FESS. The statement in the RECORD is an incorrect one, due to my own—

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Ignorance.

Mr. FESS. Not ignorance, but inadvertence in not making the correction that was made here upon the floor. I presume that I am more ignorant than you are, but I beg your pardon for not being quite as gentlemanly as you are. I made the statement on the floor here, in reference to the State of Florida, that you do not cast as many votes as any two districts in my State that I could name. That is the statement I made on the floor here.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is not the record. Why did not the gentleman correct it before he let it go to print?

Mr. FESS. Let me explain. I looked up the vote after the utterance was made, and was surprised to find that your vote in 1912 was less than 40,000, according to the World Almanac.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me just a moment?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will examine the returns of 1912 he will see that the three congressional districts voted over 44,000 and the vote for President was over 51,000.

Mr. FESS. And you have upon the floor here how many Congressmen?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. We have four now, under the last apportionment.

Mr. FESS. You have four Congressmen?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes, sir.

Mr. FESS. To each Congressman that would be less than 10,000 votes at the election?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I beg your pardon.

Mr. FESS. According to the statement in the Record.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will say to the gentleman that in the primary in 1912 there were over 25,000 Democratic votes cast in my district.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. How many votes were cast in the election? You did not give it in the directory.

Mr. FESS. I want to be fair in this matter. I do not want to be regarded as my friend from Florida has regarded me, as making a statement without any reference to its accuracy. I made the statement that there was a very small vote in your State and that I could name two districts in my own State that cast more votes than your entire State. That statement is true. The statement that is in the Record was meant to be one and a half of the vote in my district. It should have stated your entire vote will not exceed by one-half the vote which my district will cast next November. The truth is that by your own figures of 51,000 your entire State cast less than a thousand votes more than were cast in 1912 in the counties that make up my new district, which cast 50,621 votes in 1912 and will cast more than that next November. But that does not change the issue between us. If you mean that the colored man votes the same in your State that he does in my State and in other States north of the Ohio River you certainly are misinterpreting the situation. Now, secondly, you are living under the Constitution, the fourteenth amendment of which says that whenever the right to vote is denied to any male citizen of 21 years or over the basis of representation in this House shall be reduced in that State. Thus denying in proportion that those denied hold to the whole voting population, out of a voting population of 204,000, according to your statement, only 51,000 vote, or one in four. The denial to the colored man his suffrage has certainly been done, yet representation has not been reduced. And you certainly do not mean that you do not deny the right to vote to certain citizens in your State, do you?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I absolutely do. I absolutely do deny that any man in the State of Florida who pays his poll taxes to the educational fund and who can read a ticket is denied the right to vote.

Mr. FESS. And that reading is not a reading of a ticket, but the reading and interpreting the constitution of his State, as is the case of other States in the South.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not at all. There is not a word about the constitution in it.

Mr. FESS. Then you are different from Alabama, which State I was discussing when I employed the term "grandfather clause," which is a part of its constitution.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That may be; but I want to say this to the gentleman, if the gentleman will permit me—

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman should recognize that the State of Florida is a very small State. The State of Ohio is a very large State. You are more thickly populated. But we are the largest State in point of area east of the Mississippi, except one; but we have not the population.

Mr. FESS. You have over a million and a half.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No, sir. The last census gave us about three quarters of a million.

Mr. FESS. Yes; about 750,000. It was South Carolina that has the million and a half, and it was another State I was examining upon this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

(19) Publications of the Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That said publications shall be published in such editions as may be recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, but not to exceed 10,000 copies for the first edition: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to print not to exceed 20,000 copies of the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Education for distribution by the Department of the Interior.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. Is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] present, or did he leave?

A MEMBER. He is here.

Mr. WILSON of Florida. I simply wanted to say that I put in a hasty remark here a moment ago when I said that the gentleman's statement was due to ignorance. I did not mean ignorance. I should have stated "a misunderstanding of the facts," and I want to apologize to the gentleman if I offended him in any way. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I recognize that this is always a habit of my distinguished and amiable friend from Florida; and not only is it his habit, but that of every other man that I have ever heard speak from the sections that I have been discussing; that with them the mark of perfect gentlemanliness has always been present, so far as I know. I thought the gentleman's statement was a slip that he did not mean, and I resented it a little, and I beg the gentleman's pardon for the manner in which I spoke a moment ago. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk, to be inserted after the word "edition," in line 24, page 83.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 83, line 24, after the word "edition," insert "and not more than that number for a subsequent edition."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of the Committee on Printing will agree that there should be some limitation on the discretion of the bureau chief in the reprint of subsequent editions, and not permit him to continue reprinting subsequent editions ad infinitum. The amendment that I sent to the Clerk's desk would restrict the publication to a second edition.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman's amendment limit that to 10,000?

Mr. STAFFORD. I intend to follow that up by making that 25,000 or a greater number.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, this resolves itself back to the same proposition that we had before. This is a publication that now comes to the folding room if so ordered printed. The valuation account is based upon the publications that have been issued by this bureau from year to year. The bureau is given a publication account. They ask for the number that they think they can use, and we give them what they ask.

Now, if Congress decides that this is not sufficient, then the joint committee, of course, will print and make available all of the publications they want, to be charged up to the valuation account. However, we have a limitation, and the limitation is that the bureau can publish only one edition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no. The provision provides that there shall not be more than 10,000 copies of the first edition, without any limitation whatever upon subsequent editions.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, if it should develop now that a larger number than 10,000 might be demanded by the membership of the House and Senate, and that a larger edition should be printed, it would be cheaper to print one edition of 20,000 copies than two editions of 10,000 copies each. As a matter of course, under such conditions the gentleman from Wisconsin would not insist that his limitation should prevail.

Mr. STAFFORD. I grant the strength of the position taken by the gentleman, but I was under the impression that this was a provision that provided for the bulletins to be distributed by the bureau itself.

Mr. BARNHART. It does, so far as this one edition is concerned. But after that a reprint is made, and we can only get a reprint by the authority of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will recall that earlier in the session we had this very proposition pending before the committee on a bill reported from the Committee on Education, and, if I mistake not, the committee decided that there should be an edition of 25,000 copies for the first edition and restricting any further publication to an edition of a like number. I was seeking to have the bill pending before the committee conform to the action of the House taken at that time.

Mr. BARNHART. That was on the theory that the present allotment plan should continue; but inasmuch as we allow the Bureau of Education to print an edition of 10,000, it is surmised that will take care of the needs of the bureau, except in cases where Members want copies, and then they will get them from the superintendent of documents.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, it was the consensus of opinion at that time, from the report of the Bureau of Education, that 10,000 copies of these educational bulletins was altogether too small a number for distribution, and that 25,000 copies was the minimum that should be printed in the first edition. I think every Member agreed that 10,000 copies were inadequate to meet the demands of the country for these valuable educational bulletins.

Mr. BARNHART. It would be under the present law, but under the allotment plan it makes no difference how you get it, whether the Printing Office gets the money direct for the printing or whether you get it through the Bureau of Education.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not considering this from the standpoint of the valuation plan so much as I am from the standpoint of the bureau, to enable the bureau to distribute these valuable bulletins throughout the country to meet the demand that exists for them. If you are going to limit the edition to 10,000 copies for the use of the bureau, I think it is too small. The House at that time, after a thorough consideration of the subject, after three or four hours' debate, agreed that the first edition should be 25,000.

I had intended to follow up this amendment with an amendment increasing the edition from 10,000 to 25,000.

Mr. BARNHART. This part of this section was authorized by the Bureau of Education, or was suggested by it when the bill was submitted to it. It provides that it may print additional editions, of course, if it has the money to do it, and it would be in the discretion of the bureau to use its money to print either a small or a large edition. I hardly see how it would be important under this plan. This bill pertaining, as it does, to what is called the folding-room allotment to Members of Congress, it would have nothing to do with enlarging or decreasing the allotment asked for by the bureau and granted by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me ask, for the information of the committee and for my own enlightenment, whether the proviso has any reference to the editions that will be published by the Public Printer to meet the demands of Members of Congress under their allotments.

Mr. BARNHART. None whatever.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the way I construed it.

Mr. BARNHART. He might print an edition of 100,000 if there was sufficient call to justify such an edition, which would make it very much cheaper, and therefore afford very many more bulletins for the Members.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, do I understand that this proviso only seeks to restrict the number to be used by the Bureau of Education?

Mr. BARNHART. That is it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman believe that 25,000 should be substituted for 10,000? The gentleman will remember that some time ago we considered a bill reported by the Committee on Education, giving to the Bureau of Education ad libitum discretion in the number of bulletins which might be printed. The House after careful consideration of the matter decided very positively that 25,000 should be the number of the first edition, and that there should be a restriction to that number for the second edition. Does not the gentleman think for that reason that 25,000 should be substituted for 10,000?

Mr. BARNHART. I will answer that by saying that that might be true or it might not be true. The Bureau of Education might be overenthusiastic about some publication and print 50,000, and then discover that there was not much demand for it. Stranger things have happened. But the Bureau of Education itself has fixed the limit at 10,000, and it has the privilege and the authority of law to print additional prints in such editions as it sees fit. If they want to make it 25,000, I do not see anything in the bill that would restrict it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Right here you provide that of the first edition there shall not be more than 10,000 copies.

Mr. BARNHART. That is the first edition. The purpose of that is just what I explained. There might be an overenthusiastic estimate, under which a large number of bulletins might be printed, and the demand might not prove to be very great. The gentleman has seen that occur on the floor of the House. I recall that some time ago, when the price of meat went high, some enthusiast here introduced a resolution providing for the publication of hundreds of thousands—and I do not know but it went into the millions—of a bulletin on the cooking and use of meat, and I apprehend that there was not 1 Congressman in 50 who ever sent out all of his allotment of those bulletins.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. To my knowledge there were any number of Congressmen who sent out their full quotas of that bulletin. The gentleman contradicts himself, or else the Bureau of Education contradicts their earlier position.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will take the time to inquire of the folding room, he will find an enormous accumulation of those bulletins. I have a good many of them. I remember distinctly that I submitted the bulletin to a lady who I thought was something of an expert cook, and she said she would not send out a bulletin of that kind; that it was an imposition on the time and intelligence of the average cook.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me right there?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman recall the discussion that took place in the House some few months ago in the consideration of the bill that I have just referred to, increasing the number of bulletins that might be used by the Bureau of Education for distribution?

Mr. BARNHART. No; I do not remember it.

Mr. STAFFORD. We had a very heated discussion about that on two Calendar Wednesdays. At that time I remember distinctly that the Commissioner of Education called attention to the fact that 10,000 was altogether too limited an edition to meet the growing demands of the bureau, and insisted that it should be at least 25,000. This is a return to that.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARNHART. I think I can enlighten the gentleman on that. The law originally provided for an edition of 12,500, all told. The Commissioner of Education came in and asked that that be increased to 25,000. Now we start on the basis of giving them 10,000 as a first edition, and then afterwards they may publish additional editions if necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman only states it half correctly. The Commissioner of Education wanted to have 25,000 for his first edition and without limit on subsequent editions. That was the bill reported from the Committee on Education, and the House inserted the further limitation of only permitting him to have printed for his second edition the same number, namely, 25,000. That was the judgment of the House. I should think the gentleman would take the judgment of the House on that matter in connection with this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment, to strike out "10," in line 23, page 83, and substitute "25."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 83, line 23, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-five."

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 4, noes 10.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, it is very obvious from the last vote that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will not the chairman of the Committee on Printing kindly move that the committee rise?

Mr. BARNHART. No; I will not move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN (after counting). Fifty-two Members present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alken	Difenderfer	Hamilton, N. Y.	Lenroot
Alexander	Dooling	Hammond	Leshner
Allen	Doughton	Harris	Lever
Anderson	Driscoll	Harrison	Levy
Austin	Drukker	Hart	Lewis, Pa.
Baker	Dunn	Hay	Lindbergh
Barchfeld	Eagan	Hayes	Lindquist
Bartholdt	Eagle	Hensley	Linthicum
Bartlett	Edmonds	Hinds	Lloyd
Bathrick	Elder	Hinebaugh	Lobeck
Beall, Tex.	Estopinal	Hobson	Loft
Bell, Cal.	Evans	Howard	McClellan
Borland	Falson	Howell	McCoy
Brookson	Falconer	Hoxworth	McGuire, Okla.
Broussard	Farr	Hughes, W. Va.	McKellar
Brown, N. Y.	Ferris	Hulings	MacDonald
Brown, W. Va.	Fields	Hull	Manahan
Browning	Fitzgerald	Humphreys, Miss.	Manahan
Burke, Pa.	Fordney	Johnson, S. C.	Martin
Burke, Wis.	Francis	Jones	Merritt
Calder	French	Kahn	Metz
Candler, Miss.	Gardner	Kelster	Miller
Cantor	Garrett, Tenn.	Kelley, Mich.	Mondell
Carlin	George	Kelly, Pa.	Montague
Carr	Gillett	Key, Ohio	Moore
Carter	Gittins	Kieck, Pa.	Morgan, La.
Clark, Fla.	Godwin, N. C.	Kindel	Moss, W. Va.
Connelly, Kans.	Goldfogle	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Mott
Connelly, Iowa	Gorman	Kinkaid, N. J.	Murdoch
Conry	Goulden	Kitchin	Murray, Mass.
Cooper	Graham, Ill.	Knowland, J. R.	Neeley, Kans.
Copley	Graham, Pa.	Konop	Neely, W. Va.
Covington	Greene, Mass.	Korby	Nelson
Davenport	Gregg	Kreider	Nolan, J. I.
Deitrick	Guernsey	Lee, Ga.	Oldfield
Dies	Hamill	L'Engle	O'Shaunessy

Paige, Mass.
Palmer
Parker
Patten, N. Y.
Payne
Peterson
Platt
Porter
Pou
Powers
Prouty
Rainey
Reed

Riordan
Roberts, Mass.
Roberts, Nev.
Rothermel
Sabath
Scully
Seldomridge
Sells
Slomp
Sparkman
Stedman
Stevens, Nebr.
Stevens, Minn.

Stevens, N. H.
Stout
Stringer
Summers
Taggart
Talbot, Md.
Townsend
Treadway
Underhill
Vare
Vollmer
Walker
Wallin

Walsh
Walters
Watkins
Webb
Whaley
Whitacre
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Fla.
Wilson, N. Y.
Winslow
Woodruff

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 15902, finding itself without a quorum, had caused the roll to be called, and 232 Members responded to their names, and he presented a list of the absentees.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

(20) Publications of the Geological Survey, except maps, folios, and atlases, Department of the Interior: *Provided*, That the said publications shall consist of the annual report of the director, which shall be confined to one volume of octavo size; monographs and professional papers, of quarto size; bulletins, of octavo size; report on the mineral resources of the United States, which shall be published in not to exceed two volumes of octavo size, separate chapters of which on any given mineral product may be printed in pamphlet editions on request of the Director of the Geological Survey, approved by the Secretary of the Interior; water-supply papers, of octavo size; and topographic and geologic maps, folios, and atlases: *Provided further*, That two copies of each map and atlas shall be placed at the disposal of each Senator, Representative, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner, if published within his term, and that not to exceed 500 copies of each map and atlas shall be distributed gratuitously among foreign Governments and departments of our own Government, to literary and scientific associations, and to such educational institutions and libraries as may be designated by the Director of the Geological Survey and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the Department of the Interior is authorized to sell the maps and atlases prepared and published by the Geological Survey at the cost of paper and printing, as fixed by the Director of the Survey and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior may authorize the printing of any of the publications of the Geological Survey, including separate chapters on mineral resources, but excluding the annual report of the director, in such number as he may deem for the best interest of the Government, for distribution by the Department of the Interior; of the annual report of the director, not to exceed 4,000 copies shall be printed.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I notice in the proviso on page 84, line 24, that the words "Department of the Interior" are used, and in every other case the words "Secretary of the Interior." I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he wants to use the words in one case and not in the other?

Mr. BARNHART. I think that ought to be corrected. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I move that, in line 24, the word "Department" be stricken out and the word "Secretary" be inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 84, line 24, strike out the word "Department" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Secretary."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I noted the suggestion made by my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], and the query came into my mind whether you do not wish to leave this to the department or some bureau chief. I direct attention to the same phraseology on line 9, page 85, which reads "for distribution by the Department of the Interior." In that particular you would not wish to have the phraseology changed to "Secretary."

Mr. BARNHART. I think it would be better to use the word "Secretary," in line 24, page 84, and I trust that the amendment may be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, in line 9, page 85, I think the word "Department" should be stricken out and the word "Secretary" inserted. I offer that amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 85, line 9, strike out the word "Department" and insert the word "Secretary."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

(b) Farmers' bulletins: *Provided*, That such bulletins shall be adapted to the interests of the farmers of the different sections of the country: *Provided further*, That on and after September 4, 1914, no copies of farmers' bulletins shall be printed for distribution except as authorized by this act, but each Senator, Representative, and Delegate shall be entitled to distribute the bulletins that may then be to his credit with the Department of Agriculture, and four-fifths of the amount available at that time for the specific purpose of printing farmers' bulletins of the allotment for printing and binding for the Department of

Agriculture shall thereupon be transferred and credited to the allotment for printing and binding for Congress.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, line 16, after the word "after," strike out "September" and insert in lieu thereof the word "March."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, line 16, after the word "and," strike out the word "fourteen" and insert the word "fifteen."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee the real intent of this proviso. As I understand, under existing law the department has one-fifth of the farmers' bulletins now printed for distribution, as the Secretary sees fit. This proviso would seek to discontinue the available one-fifth of those publications at his command.

Mr. BARNHART. That was not the intention. It discontinues the four-fifths and leaves him the one-fifth that he now has for the balance of the fiscal year. The purpose was to give the Secretary of Agriculture the bulletins that he is now entitled to for his own distribution.

Mr. STAFFORD. I call the gentleman's attention to the following language in the proviso:

Provided further, That on and after March 4, 1915, no copies of farmers' bulletins shall be printed for distribution except as authorized by this act.

Where will there be any authority in the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain those farmers' bulletins which he now distributes if you carry that phraseology? Under existing law, as the gentleman knows, there is a provision for distribution by the Secretary of one-fifth of the allotment.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will refer back to page 85, paragraph 22, he will find the general authorization there for the Secretary of Agriculture to print such number of copies of reports and bulletins, containing not more than 100 octavo pages each, and of his annual report for distribution by the Department of Agriculture, as he shall deem for the best interest of the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is an introductory paragraph to the various subdivisions which follow, which enumerate the various character of publications, and the second subdivision is farmers' bulletins. In the provision we are now considering you absolutely repeal, in the language that I have pointed out, all authority for printing any additional farmers' bulletins. That phraseology would certainly refer to the farmers' bulletins authorized now for distribution by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BARNHART. I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if it would not make it clearer if, after the word "distribution," in line 17, we inserted the words "by Members of Congress."

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the purpose of the proviso at all? Does it accomplish anything except to meet the temporary conditions which will confront the department when this law goes into effect, as far as farmers' bulletins are concerned?

Mr. BARNHART. The purpose intended was that the department might use its one-fifth, but could not use all of the other. Really, I do not see, if it takes effect in the future—next March—that it makes any difference if we entirely eliminate it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not strike out the proviso entirely? That would remove all ambiguity and all doubt.

Mr. BARNHART. The trouble would be that, instead of a new, incoming Member of Congress having available four-fifths of the documents that had been transferred to the superintendent of documents, the Department of Agriculture would have the use of them until the beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the existing practice Members of Congress are entitled to the quota already provided, which will expire at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1915.

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman thinks best to make the motion to strike it out, the committee will not object.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suggest that the gentleman better first withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana withdraws his amendment, without objection, and the gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, line 15, strike out the remainder of the paragraph beginning with the words "Provided further."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 86, at the end of line 26, add the following: "Provided further, That there be collected, assembled, and bound into a single volume the bulletins of the Department of Agriculture on cooking and domestic science, the volume to be entitled 'Uncle Sam's Cook Book'; and that of these volumes there shall be printed 200,000 copies, 140,000 for the use of the House of Representatives and 60,000 for the use of the Senate."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

(h) Annual Report of the Beet Sugar Industry in the United States, Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to print and distribute annually not to exceed 8,000 copies of the said annual report covering the progress of the beet-sugar industry in the United States: *Provided further*, That the preparation and publication of such annual reports shall be within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 88, following line 5, insert as a new paragraph: "(i) Special Report on the Diseases of Cattle and Special Report on the Diseases of the Horse, Department of Agriculture: *Provided*, That whenever necessary the same shall be revised and brought to date under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

(23) Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance, Department of Commerce: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to print not to exceed 4,000 copies for distribution by the Department of Commerce.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman to withhold that for a moment until I offer an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Very well.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 88, line 6, after the word "Commerce," strike out the words "and Finance."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I understand the paragraph under consideration is subsection 24. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the committee the real need of having a publication of the reports on foreign commerce and navigation?

Mr. BARNHART. Well, Mr. Chairman, I can hardly answer that except to say that in the preparation of this bill these matters, item by item, were taken up by the authorities, and such publications were eliminated as they reported no calls for, but in order to make the bill broad enough and in order to take care of every possible contingency we left that in; but, of course, if there is no demand for them there will be no printing of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. There will be certainly the first printing.

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; there will be the first printing.

Mr. STAFFORD. And they may become a drug on the shelves of the department.

Mr. BARNHART. There will be no printing unless they are authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing, as a matter of course, and there would be no authorization by the Joint Committee on Printing unless there should be a demand from the membership of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. I question whether any Member has ever availed himself of these annual reports, comprising, as I recall, a lot of statistical information of very little value when printed. I thought it of such a character that it could be purposely eliminated from the bill.

Mr. BARNHART. It is possible it would never be called for. If it should be, the department has already the printing and the plates, and it would give Members an opportunity under the valuation plan, and there might be a change in conditions ensue by which there would be a revision of the form of it, and eventually it might become more valuable. It will certainly incur no expense unless there is a demand for it.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is an expense in the compilation of the large tome which the gentleman has in his hand.

Mr. BARNHART. The department will issue these on its own account. This publication is by the Department of Commerce, and they will continue to issue it as a part of their appropriation. If they do not, of course there could be no reprint.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 68. PAR. 5. Copies of Government publications subject to distribution under this section shall be printed promptly when the same shall be ready for publication, and shall be bound in paper or cloth, as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the next paragraph carries a provision that will be of interest to each Member of the House and inasmuch as the committee feels that it ought to be taken up at a time when there is a larger representation than there is now, and as there is no disposition upon the part of the committee to make the point of no quorum, I am going to ask that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15902 and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13311. An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following joint resolutions:

H. J. Res. 335. Joint resolution to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war," approved July 21, 1914;

H. J. Res. 339. Joint resolution to correct an error in H. R. 12914; and

H. J. Res. 342. Joint resolution to correct an error in H. R. 12914.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House meets on Friday next I may address the House for one hour on the subject of the cotton situation in the South.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that when the House meets on Friday, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the clearing of the Speaker's table, and conference reports, he shall be permitted to address the House for one hour. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the gentleman concede the right to somebody from districts representing shoe manufactories and machinery manufactories, all of which need to be upheld and the products placed in warehouses on account of not being sold—

Mr. HEFLIN. I will not object to anybody speaking whose products are affected as we are on account of the war.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like very much to see all of those things taken care of by the Government, if that question is to be—

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will couple with his request that some person on this side shall have the right to speak, for one I shall not object; otherwise I shall.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not object to my request to present my views. I am not trying to get time for somebody else to present views. I want to present my views on this question.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman will realize there is no opportunity for Members on this side at the present time to enter into general debate on matters pertaining to the welfare of the country. All we ask is that we be given a like time on this side.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the gentleman on that side will ask for somebody to speak an hour, I will not object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Embody in your request that somebody on this side be allowed to speak an hour on general subjects.

Mr. HEFLIN. I want to state to the gentleman that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURGESS] spoke 50 minutes on this subject, and there was no objection to it, and the other gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] spoke 10 minutes. I did not agree with the views they expressed to some extent. I want a chance to speak on this cotton industry. There are 30,000,000 people dependent on this industry, and I want to speak concerning it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection if you will couple with your request that some Member on this side shall have an hour to speak on some subject.

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know that you have anyone who wants an hour.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are plenty of them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, October 1, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting, in accordance with the provisions of an act approved March 4, 1913, annual report of the United States Express Co. (H. Doc. No. 1169), received September 22, 1914, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KEATING, from the Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17800) to regulate the method of directing the work of Government employees, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1175), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18794) granting an increase of pension to Charles McCurdy, and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 19038) making an appropriation for the improvement of Los Angeles Harbor, at Los Angeles, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 19039) providing for the nationalization of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19040) amending the acts relating to the granting of pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. METZ: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 360) authorizing the Secretary of War to use any allotment made under the provisions of H. R. 13811, Sixty-third Congress, second session, for the improvement of East River and Hell Gate, N. Y.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 361) to correct certain errors in H. R. 12045, H. R. 12914, H. R. 13542, H. R. 14234, H. R. 14738, H. R. 15692, and H. R. 16294; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 19041) to correct the military record of William Mauchamar; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 19042) for the relief of the legal representatives of the Beaufort Library Society; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYRNES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 19043) for the relief of the estate of Ed Lawrence, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DECKER: A bill (H. R. 19044) for the relief of Ella M. Wheeler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEITRICK: A bill (H. R. 19045) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Ordway; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 19046) granting a pension to Bridget Gaffney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19047) granting an increase of pension to Ella A. Buckley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 19048) granting a pension to Sarah Moorehead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19049) granting a pension to Joseph Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19050) granting a pension to Elizabeth Walter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19051) granting an increase of pension to Carrie B. Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19052) to correct the military record of Peter A. Potticher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 19053) granting an increase of pension to Oliver W. Walden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 19054) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Burnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND: A bill (H. R. 19055) granting a pension to Ralph C. Eulass; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 19056) granting a pension to Emma M. Wolf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 19057) granting an increase of pension to John C. Maddox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 19058) granting a pension to Catherine Seymour; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 19059) for the relief of Edward B. Hughes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of Pennsylvania State Association of Letter Carriers, favoring the passage of the McGillicuddy bill, relative to pay for letter carriers when off sick; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Waverly Oil Works Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pittsburgh (Pa.) Oil Refining Co., protesting against revenue tax on petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BORCHERS: Petitions of business men of the State of Illinois, favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition by 100 citizens and residents of San Joaquin County, Cal., in favor of amendment to be offered to section 85 of House bill 15902; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DICKINSON: Petition of 178 citizens of the sixth district of Missouri, relating to Senate joint resolution 144 and House joint resolution 282; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: Petition of 131 citizens of Westmoreland, Kans., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Memorial of Providence Council, No. 67, United Commercial Travelers of America, favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KONOP: Petitions of cashiers of First National Bank and Citizens' National Bank, of Appleton; State Bank, of Seymour; First National Bank of Crandon, and board of directors of the Citizens' National Bank, of Green Bay, Wis., protesting against tax on capital stock and surplus of banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Tamaqua (Pa.) National Bank, First National Bank of Frankville, Pa., and Schuylkill Haven Trust Co., of Pennsylvania, protesting against tax on capital stock and surplus of banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pennsylvania State Association of Letter Carriers, of Harrisburg, Pa., favoring passage of the McGill-

cuddy bill for pay for carriers when off sick; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Pittsburgh (Pa.) Oil Refining Co., protesting against revenue tax on petroleum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McANDREWS: Petition of Grand Army of the Republic national encampment, adopted at Detroit, Mich., September 1, 1914, favoring national encampment at Vicksburg National Park; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petitions of 61 citizens of the United States, relative to due credit to Dr. Cook for his polar efforts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of members of Fraternal Brotherhood of Maple Leaf Lodge, No. 360, favoring Hamill civil-service bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of board of directors of Chamber of Mines and Oil, Los Angeles, Cal., favoring passage by Congress of an emergency measure suspending the operation of mining laws; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petition of 100 citizens of the United States, relative to due credit to Dr. Cook for his polar efforts; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, October 1, 1914.

(Legislative day of Monday, September 28, 1914.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

PROPOSED ANTITRUST LEGISLATION.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill (H. R. 15657) to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I was diverted last evening from the line of argument which I was attempting to make. I do not desire to take too much of the time of the Senate, so I shall ask generally at this time that I may be permitted to insert in my remarks some quotations from decisions from which I had intended to read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Lea, Tenn.	Shafroth	Vardaman
Borah	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ga.	Warren
Bryan	O'Gorman	Smith, Mich.	Weeks
Chamberlain	Oliver	Smoot	West
Chilton	Overman	Sterling	White
Clapp	Page	Swanson	Williams
Culberson	Perkins	Thompson	
Gore	Pittman	Thornton	
Kern	Reed	Townsend	

Mr. BRYAN. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] is necessarily absent from the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] are necessarily absent. The senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND] is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. WARREN. I wish to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. CLARK]. He is paired with the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. I make this statement for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. SHEPPARD, and Mr. THOMAS answered to their names when called.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Arizona, and Mr. LANE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. CULBERSON. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. BANKHEAD, and Mr. HUGHES entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. HUGHES. I desire to announce the absence of the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on important business.

Mr. POMERENE, Mr. LEE of Maryland, Mr. NELSON, Mr. JAMES, Mr. OWEN, Mr. MYERS, and Mr. NORRIS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, it is my purpose now to call attention to the decisions in the cases known as the Standard Oil and the Tobacco cases and to some opinions which followed in the wake of those opinions, so that we may see how thoroughly the court has dealt with this subject, which is not only of concern to the people but a matter of consideration in the Senate. Everyone looked upon the approaching decisions in the Standard Oil case and in the Tobacco case as likely to be conclusive as to the final and settled construction of the Sherman antitrust law.

It was felt, Mr. President, that if these combinations and trusts were dissolved by the Supreme Court and it was found that the Sherman law was sufficient and efficient to deal with such combinations as those the statute would thereafter be regarded as effective for the great purpose for which it was enacted. On the other hand, it was believed that the case against these combinations would be the real test as to the efficiency of this law and that if they should escape the condemnation of the statute it would be wholly ineffective thereafter.

For a time after the rendition of these decisions it was believed that the court had read into the statute a phrase which would likely render the statute thereafter, in large measure, effective; but, as public opinion settled down and it came to be known that these decisions had really condemned every conceivable form of monopoly against which the people have ever complained, as the decisions came to be better and more fully understood, the country arrived at the conclusion that the Sherman antitrust law had become a great, powerful, effective statute.

I quote a single paragraph from the body of the Standard Oil decision, found in Two hundred and twenty-first United States, at page 59, wherein it is said:

That in view of the many new forms of contracts and combinations which were being evolved from existing economic conditions, it was deemed essential by an all-embracing enumeration to make sure that no form of contract or combination by which an undue restraint of interstate or foreign commerce was brought about could save such restraint from condemnation. The statute under this view evidenced the intent not to restrain the right to make and enforce contracts, whether resulting from combination or otherwise, which did not unduly restrain interstate or foreign commerce, but to protect that commerce from being restrained by methods, whether old or new, which would constitute an interference that is an undue restraint.

Every conceivable form of contract or combination arising out of economic conditions, new or old, and every form of monopoly of the ten thousand different subtle forms in which it might appear was adjudged to be within the inhibition of the statute, provided it affected unduly interstate commerce, or provided that it built up a monopoly or was a step in the direction of building up a monopoly.

It is well to bear in mind, Mr. President, that the word "unreasonable" can have effect only upon the first section of the Sherman antitrust law; that as to the second section, which deals with monopoly, the court condemned all conceivable forms of monopoly, and, furthermore, inhibited and condemned every step which would lead to the formation of a monopoly. There is no act which would be considered or regarded as tending to build up a monopoly that is not now inhibited by the Sherman antitrust law, and you may go into a court of equity and prevent that single act from being accomplished or achieved if its tendency be to build up a monopoly, or if it be a step in that direction. There could be no more complete condemnation of monopoly, which is the real evil from which the country is suffering, than is found in these decisions. The court says further:

Undoubtedly the words "to monopolize" and "monopolize" as used in the section reach every act bringing about the prohibited results. The ambiguity, if any, is involved in determining what is intended by "monopolize." But this ambiguity is readily dispelled in the light of the previous history of the law of restraint of trade to